CHRISTIAN BAPTISM

BAP
L2456

Library of the Theological Seminary,
PRINCETON, N. J.

Presented by Mr. Samuel Agnew of Philadelphia, Pa.

Agnew Coll. on Baptism, No. [illegible]

SCB
10102.

THE

NATURE AND DESIGN

OF

CHRISTIAN BAPTISM,

BY R. A. LANCASTER.

"One Lord, one faith, one baptism."—*Ephesians* iv. 5.

"And the scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the gospel unto Abraham, saying, in thee shall all nations be blessed."—*Galatians* iii. 8.

MANCHESTER:
FLETCHER AND TUBBS, JOHN DALTON STREET.
1855.

PREFACE.

In submitting a few thoughts on the Nature and Design of Christian Baptism, I would not have the reader to think that I am the opponent of those who hold Immersion to be the fulfilment of the command, "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." It is not with the people distinguished by the name of Baptists, but with the doctrines they teach, with which I have to do, as being contrary, and opposed to the Word of God; and if I should succeed in proving this, I shall feel satisfied that I have not established any doctrine of my own, but such as is taught in the Word of God. I am grieved to learn that many Baptists are offended, because they are classed with the rigid, or Antinomian sect of Baptists, in my *Infant Baptism Scripturally Defended;* but on examination of the matter, they will see that the blame must be attached to themselves—both sects calling themselves, "Particular Baptists." But, in order to avoid confusion in the

following pages, I shall distinguish the rigid, or Calvinistic sect of Baptists, from the general body.

A Reply having been published to *Infant Baptism Scripturally Defended*, by Mr. PRICE, many friends have been anxiously expecting me writing again; however, on carefully examining the publication, I find that it would be useless to reply to one, who has admitted more than I could have expected from a rigid Baptist, and therefore I shall content myself with just noticing those admissions as I proceed, hoping that Mr. PRICE will, ere long, carry his new faith into practice, by becoming a Pædo-Baptist. For this cause I am thankful that my publication has been useful in obtaining from an opponent, important concessions to the truth, which enable me to conclude that I have not laboured in vain; and that those humble services have been of use in the church of Christ, in establishing the doctrine of the inseparable connection of the child with the parent, as partakers together of the blessings of the gospel, through the ordinance of Christian baptism.

My object in sending forth this Work, is more particularly to refute the presumptuous doctrines of the rigid Baptists, who frequently advertise in their leading Magazines for situations where they may hear "the gospel," and "the truth," as advo-

cated by those Magazines. They do well in saying "the gospel," and "the truth," as advocated by those Magazines, for it will enable me to show that such a "gospel and truths" are not the "gospel and truths" of the Bible.

Trusting that I shall do this with all Christian forbearance, and gentleness of spirit, becoming one who professes the name of Christ, yet faithfully and openly dealing with the arguments of those who would shut us out from the gospel and the truth, because we do not see it, as advocated in their Magazines; and I sincerely hope that the following pages may be the instrument in the hands of God, of leading many to a serious and thoughtful reflection, concerning the NATURE AND DESIGN OF CHRISTIAN BAPTISM: then we shall ascribe all praise, glory, and dominion, to Him who is "over all, God, blessed for ever. Amen."

R. A. LANCASTER.

Moss Side, November, 1855.

ERRATA.

In page 75, line 2, read *and the opening of the prison,* for "and open the prison."

THE

NATURE AND DESIGN

OF

CHRISTIAN BAPTISM.

Know ye therefore, that they that are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham. And the scripture foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the Gospel unto Abraham, saying, "In thee shall all nations be blessed."—Gal. iii. 7, 8. Thus the gospel of Christ was preached to Abraham, and the covenant established as an everlasting covenant. Such being the case, the gospel is no novelty, but the "everlasting gospel," [Rev. xiv. 6.] by which, God is pleased to make known His will, to "every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people," Saying, with a loud voice, "Fear God, and give glory to him; for the hour of his judgment is come: and worship him that made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and the fountains of water." This is the gospel which was "preached unto the spirits in prison; Which sometime were disobedient, when once the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was preparing, wherein few, that is, eight souls were saved by water."—1 Peter, iii. 19, 20. It was the gospel preached to Abraham; including Jew and Gentile in the covenant through faith. It was the gospel preached by Moses in the wilderness.

"but the word preached did not profit them, not being mixed with faith in them that heard it."—Heb. iv. 2. It was the gospel preached to the noble Bereans, which they proved from the Old Testament scripture. [Acts xvii. 11.] It was the gospel preached by the apostle Paul, of which he said, "though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that we have preached unto you, let him be accursed."—Gal. i. 8. Therefore, THUS SAITH THE LORD, "Take heed how you hear: for whosoever hath, to him shall be given; and whosoever hath not, from him shall be taken, even that which he seemeth to have."—Luke viii. 18. Seeing then, that "All scripture is given by inspiration of God," and "able to make wise unto salvation through faith, which is in Christ Jesus," and is "profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: That the man of God may be perfect, throughly furnished unto all good works," [2 Timothy, iii. 15, 16.] so that there can be no doctrine in the New Testament, but may be found in the Old Testament; and no ordinance in the New Testament, but is typified in the Old Testament; we are justified, therefore, in taking the Old Testament as the basis of our rule of faith, which is confirmed by the New Testament. "For the law having a shadow of good things to come, and not the very image of the things, can never with those sacrifices which they offered year by year continually make the comers thereunto perfect," [Heb. x. 1.] but by faith, which "is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen." [Heb. xi. 1.] "For Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth," [Rom. x. 4.] being "the substance of things hoped for in the law." Thus he came "not to destroy the law, but to fulfil," [Matt. v. 17.] and to establish the covenant with His people. "I will put my laws into their mind, and write

them in their hearts: and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people."—Heb. viii. 10. Hence we see that the law and promises are combined in one "everlasting covenant," as given to Abraham: "I will be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee."—Gen. xvii. 7. "For all the law is fulfilled in one word, even in this; Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself."—Gal. v. 14. "Is the law then against the promises of God? God forbid: for if there had been a law given which could have given life, verily righteousness should have been by the law. But the scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise by faith through Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe."—Gal. iii. 21, 22. "Seeing it is one God, which shall justify the circumcision by faith, and uncircumcision through faith. Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid: yea, we establish the law."—Rom. iii. 30, 31. Therefore, having such scripture testimony as this, we are bound to conclude there is no proof of repeal in the principle or design of the Abrahamic covenant and the law, whatever change may have been effected in the ceremonial application of the law, by the coming of Christ.

This, will lead us to consider the Nature and Design of Christian Baptism, in the following order:—

I.—The Covenant of Circumcision, viewed in connection with Christian Baptism, as a perpetual ordinance in the Church.

II.—Infant Baptism, practised by the Jews, a sufficient guarantee for the continuance of the same in the Christian Church.

III.—Baptism by Affusion, the only Scriptural Baptism acknowledged by Christ, and practised by the Apostles.

IV.—The practice of Dipping, inconsistent and contrary to the word of God.

FIRST.—*The Covenant of Circumcision, viewed in connection with Christian Baptism, as a perpetual ordinance in the Church.*

"Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, and to seeds, as of many; but as of one, And to thy seed which is Christ. And this I say, that the covenant, that was confirmed before of God in Christ, the law, which was four hundred and thirty years after, cannot disannul, that it should make the promise of none effect."—Gal. iii. 16, 17. Having such evidence as this, we must come to the conclusion, that there has been no repeal of the covenant given to Abraham, but is still in force in the church, being confirmed by Christ himself. "Now I say that Jesus Christ was a minister of the circumcision for the truth of God, to confirm the promises made unto the fathers."—Rom. xv. 8. Here then we have the truth of God in the covenant of circumcision *confirmed*, not abolished. Therefore, there can be no just grounds for us to set aside what it teaches, in connecting parent and child with the blessings pertaining to that covenant, for in so doing, we should be preaching another gospel, and refusing the truth confirmed by Christ. It behoves us, therefore, to be mindful how we handle the word of God, that we bring not upon us the dreadful curse, named by the Apostle Paul. [Gal. i. 8, 9.]

In the confession of the Baptist Churches of the Norfolk and Suffolk Association, we find the following declaration—"We are kept by the power of our covenant God, steadfast in the great and glorious truths of the everlasting gospel."* Here we have men professing to be "kept in the great and glorious truths of the everlasting gospel:" yet, denying in part that gospel, by

*Baptist Register, Vol. 4. 1801-2, page 81.

refusing infants the rights and privileges connected with the gospel through baptism, on the ground of their unconsciousness and incapability of distinguishing the Nature and Design of Christian Baptism. Hence, they admit adults only to the ordinance of baptism.

But, on close examination into the nature and design of circumcision, we find that it was not only designed for the infant, but the adult. The language of the covenant being addressed to the parent and not to the child; "I will be a God unto thee, and ye shall circumcise the flesh of your foreskin; and it shall be a token of the covenant betwixt me and you. And the uncircumcised man-child whose flesh of his foreskin is not circumcised, that soul shall be cut off from his people; he hath broken my covenant."—Gen. xvii. 7, 10, 14. Now, the child would be totally unconscious of this; therefore, it could only be intended for the adult; yet, notwithstanding, the child was to be brought into covenant relationship with God, by the token on his flesh; to be instructed as he grew, in the nature and design of that relationship with his God. Hence, we read when God was about to destroy Sodom. "Shall I hide from Abraham that thing which I do; seeing that Abraham shall surely become a great and mighty nation, and all the nations of the earth shall be blessed in him? For I know him, that he will command his children and his household after him, and they shall keep the way of the Lord, to do justice and judgment."—Gen. xix. 19. Again, the covenant of circumcision was designed to teach a sanctification of the body, by the token in the flesh of the child; and a sanctification of the soul to the adult, through faith. On comparing the scriptures, it will be found, that all things were considered unholy until they were sanctified, or set apart: thus in Lev. xix. 23, 24, we read—"And when ye shall come into the land, and

have planted all manner of trees for food, then ye shall count the fruit thereof as uncircumcised: three years shall it be as uncircumcised unto you: it shall not be eaten of. But in the fourth year all the fruit thereof, shall be holy to praise the Lord withal." From this we learn, that all things were considered as holy when circumcised. Therefore, circumcision must be a means of sanctification. Again, we are told this was not the only means of sanctification, for the same idea is taught by sprinkling, pouring, and anointing. Hence, we read in Lev. viii. 10, 12, "And Moses took the anointing oil, and anointed the tabernacle and all that was therein, and sanctified them. And he sprinkled thereof upon the altar seven times, and anointed the altar and all his vessels, both the laver and his foot, to sanctify them. And he poured of the anointing oil upon Aaron's head, and anointed him to sanctify him." Thus, the oil symbolized the descent of the Divine Spirit, as in the case of David when anointed by Samuel, it is said, "And the spirit of the Lord came upon David, from that day forward." Here we have sprinkling, or pouring set forth, as the outward means of sanctification, and confirmed by the descent of the Holy Spirit. Then, if we compare this with the pouring out of the Holy Spirit in the New Testament, we must come to the conclusion that his descent must be symbolized in no other way, than sprinkling or pouring. Hence, we learn the idea of sprinkling, as a means of sanctification, in the same sense as circumcision; and adopt it, not as a matter of "convenience," as some say, but because it is from heaven, and taught to us by God; for He himself hath declared, "For all the first-born of the children of Israel are mine, both man and beast: on the day that I smote every first-born in the land of Egypt I sanctified them for myself."—Num. viii. 17. Seeing then, that God is pleased to sanctify, or set

apart the infant for himself, have we not direct proof for our practice, in setting apart the infant for God, by following up the ancient faith commanded by God? "And thou shalt set the Levites before Aaron, and before his sons, and offer them for an offering unto the Lord. And thus shalt thou do unto them to cleanse them: sprinkle water of purifying upon them."—Num. viii. 7, 13. Now, as this sprinkling of water, was so important a part of the ceremonial service connected with the Jewish Church, and attended with the same consequences if neglected, as in circumcision: [Gen. xvii. 14, Num. xix. 13.] it is not very likely that the Jews would refuse their children the water of purifying, since they were obliged to purify by sprinkling all things, both animate and inanimate. [Num. xix. 18.] Hence we learn, that this sprinkling of water, did not disannul the covenant of circumcision, that it should be of no effect, though it conveyed to the mind of the Jew, the same idea of sanctification of the flesh, and also gave the same judgment as on the uncircumcised. "That soul shall be cut off from Israel, because the water of separation was not sprinkled upon him."—Num. xix. 13. Then may we not adopt the language of the poet and say:—

> "Abraham believed the promised grace
> And gave his son to God;
> But water seals the blessing now,
> That once was seal'd with blood."

Mr. PRICE believes this, when attempting to refute *Infant Baptism Scripturally Defended*. He gives us the following in page 6—"It is true that circumcision and baptism both teach and represent a change of heart and life, and therefore agree in this particular."—Col. ii. 11, 12. Now this is all that I want, and more than I could have expected from one, who professes to write against Infant Baptism. For if circumcision and baptism con-

vey to the mind of the adult, the same idea of "a change of heart and life," and if circumcision was commanded to be given to the infant, why not baptism which precisely teaches the same thing? Therefore, all other arguments Mr. PRICE may advance against Infant Baptism, will be superfluous—the inseparable connection of the Abrahamic covenant, with the ordinance of Christian baptism, being fully proved. Yet, there are some who deny that baptism takes the place of circumcision, because the token was given to males only. Hence, we find Mr. ALCORN saying, "This notion of baptism coming in room of circumcision, carries its absurdity and refutation on the very face of it. It was only the male children among the Jews that were circumcised. Now, if this proves anything at all about baptism, it proves that only the male children of believers ought to be baptized."* This may appear very plausible in the eyes of some, but on a careful examination of the scriptures, such arguments appear very shallow; for if circumcision was given as a seal of the covenant to the male alone, then the female must be excluded from all the blessings included in that covenant. Before we adopt such a mode of reasoning as this from Mr. A., let us see what God says. "I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel." Here we see the promise was to be fulfilled through the woman. Therefore, the promise given to Abraham, could not be fulfilled without the promise given to the woman, so that the "seed of the woman," has just as much to do with the promises, as the seed of Abraham, though the seal of the covenant is only given to the male; which could convey no blessing to the infant, beyond that of a sanctification of the body, of which the female was not deprived during the separation and purification of her parent. [Lev. xii. 5, 6.]

* Lectures on Christian Baptism.

Once more, the female was not altogether deprived of a participation in the covenant of circumcision; since the language of Moses, was as applicable to her as the male. "Circumcise therefore, the foreskin of your heart, and be no more stiffnecked."—Deut. x. 16. Also, Jeremiah addresses not only the males, but all the inhabitants of Jerusalem, saying, "Circumcise yourselves to the Lord, and take away the foreskins of your hearts, ye men of Judah and inhabitants of Jerusalem: lest my fury come forth like fire, and burn that none can quench it, because of the evil of your doings."—Jer. iv, 4. Seeing then, there were given to the people of Israel such exhortations as these, from two of their greatest teachers, can we refuse to the female, that which circumcision was designed to teach, namely, "a change of heart and life," of which the apostle Paul, when addressing the church at Rome, says, "He is not a Jew, which is one outwardly; neither is that circumcision which is outward in the flesh: but he is a Jew, which is one inwardly; and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter; whose praise is not of men, but of God."—Rom. ii. 28, 29. Here we have the design of circumcision distinctly taught, by the apostle of the Gentiles. Then do we err, if we maintain the doctrine of a spiritual circumcision in the church of Christ? When the same Apostle says, "We are the circumcision which worship God in the spirit, and rejoice in Christ Jesus, and have no confidence in the flesh."—Phil. iii. 3. "If the uncircumcision keep the righteousness of the law, shall not his uncircumcision be counted for circumcision?"—Rom. ii. 26. This being so, we shall by no means be justified in setting aside the doctrine taught by the Apostle, but rather seek to establish it, by the corresponding rite of baptism, which the apostle also teaches through faith. [Col. ii. 11, 12.] Then there will be no difficulty in the way of baptizing

either male or female, both being one in Christ.—Gal. iii. 28. Keeping these things constantly in view, we shall be careful how we deal with the everlasting covenants of God, "With whom is no variableness, or shadow of turning."—James i. 17.

Then it is for those who contend for the "everlasting counsels of Jehovah, everlasting love," and, in fact, everything that has everlasting about it, *but* the covenant made with Abraham, to show us, *when* God repealed any of His everlasting covenants, and, if they cannot do this, we shall claim the only right, of perpetuating the everlasting counsels and purposes of Jehovah, in giving to the child, the seal of the covenant; though we do not strictly adhere to the letter, but maintain the spirit, as taught by the apostle Paul. [Rom. ii. 29.] And in doing so, do we more than the Baptists, who profess to be guided by a "THUS SAITH THE LORD," for their faith and practice, and yet hold the first day of the week, instead of the seventh, as the sabbath? Is it because it is more "convenient?" If they take the "example of the apostles for their faith and practice," why do they set aside the "holy kiss," and the "kiss of charity?"—[Rom. xvi. 16, 1 Peter, v. 14.] and be content with the custom of embracing the hand. Or, why do they not anoint the sick "with oil in the name of the Lord?"—James v. 14. Is it because it is inconvenient? Then are we more guilty than they, because we maintain the spirit, instead of the letter of the law? Surely, when they seriously reflect on these things, they will see that these are neither matters of convenience nor inconvenience; but will agree with us, that "Wisdom is justified of her children."—Matt. xi. 19.

Again, Mr. ALCORN asks, "why do the Pædo-Baptists not allow their 'holy' children to participate with them in the ordinance of the Lord's Supper?" Here Mr. ALCORN

supposes, because we baptize children, we ought also to allow them to partake of the Lord's Supper. But, had he carefully examined the nature and design of the Jewish Passover, as a perpetual ordinance, I am convinced he would never have sent forth such a supposition. For do we not read "And the blood shall be to you for a token upon the houses where ye are; and when I see the blood, I will pass over you, and the plague shall not be upon you to destroy you, when I smite the land of Egypt. And this day shall be unto you for a memorial; and ye shall keep it a feast to the Lord throughout your generations; ye shall keep it a feast by an ordinance for ever." Exodus xii. 13, 14. Here we see the token of this ordinance was given to the adult only; the child being totally unconscious of what was going on around him, therefore could not be a partaker of the feast, neither was it intended that he should be. For we read, that Moses "Through faith kept the passover, and the sprinkling of blood." Heb. xi. 28. When our Lord partook of the passover, he said, "I will not drink henceforth of the fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom."—Matt. xxvi. 29. Here our Lord does not abolish the passover, but institutes His supper upon it, which is to be continued in heaven, and so confirms it "an ordinance for ever." "Christ our passover, being sacrificed for us."—1 Cor. v. 6, 7. Therefore, there must of necessity, be a change in the token, or sprinkling of blood, which does not affect in the least, that which the ordinance was designed to teach—"the sanctification of the spirit unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ."—1 Peter, i. 2. Then, "Let us draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water."—Heb. x. 22. Hence, the sprinkling of the heart was only intended for

the adult, through faith. Yet by the same token of the sprinkling of blood, God was pleased to save the little ones of the children of Israel, though they were unconscious of it. And he was not unmindful of their instruction when He commanded His servant Moses to speak unto the people, saying, "And it shall come to pass, when your children shall say unto you, what mean you by this service? That ye shall say, it is the sacrifice of the Lord's passover, who passed over the houses of the children of Israel in Egypt, when He smote the Egyptians, and delivered our houses."—Exodus xii. 26, 27. A "THUS SAITH THE LORD," for the faith and practice, of all rigid and particular Baptists.

Then, look at the characters to be admitted to this ordinance. "No uncircumcised person shall eat thereof." Exodus xii. 48. Hence, we learn the two ordinances are linked together; and they must stand, or fall together. Whatever alteration may have taken place in the token, we are bound to maintain them in the church, "by an ordinance for ever." And there is no one more particular in observing this, than the Baptists by their practice; "no unbaptized person shall eat thereof." But the validity of that baptism, we question, as Christian baptism.

Had Mr. ALCORN been particular in examining his Bible, he would have found that circumcision was not the only qualification, for admission to the passover; but some knowledge of the nature and design of that ordinance, according as they had been commanded to be instructed. Hence, we find our Lord Himself did not go up to Jerusalem, until He was "twelve years old, after the custom of the feast."—Matt. ii. 42. So that, circumcision was given as a token, or seal, of the sanctification of the body, to teach a sanctification of the soul of the believer, which would enable him to discern through

faith, the keeping of the passover, and the nature of that redemption that was to be accomplished by Christ, for Israel. Therefore, the token of circumcision given to the infant, bestowing no qualification during infancy to partake of the passover; and baptism teaching the same, there can be no argument in favour of infants being admitted to the Lord's Supper.

Circumcision was not given to distinguish the Jews as a nation, nor did it entitle them to the possession of the promised land. This is evident from the command given to Abraham, "he that is eight days old, shall be circumcised among you, every man-child in your generations; he that is born in the house, or bought with money of any stranger, which is not of thy seed."—Gen. xvii. 12. Here we find circumcision was designed not only for the Jew, but for the Gentile, who should acknowledge the faith of Abraham, and enter into covenant relationship with God; and so be separated from heathenism by circumcision. In this we find the type of baptism. "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."—Matt. xxviii. 19. "That the Gentiles should be fellow heirs, and of the same body, and partakers of His promise in Christ by the gospel."—Eph. iii. 6.

Then this promise, of which circumcision was the seal, contained something more than the possession of temporal blessings, such as being distinguished as a nation, or possessing "a land flowing with milk and honey." Since Abraham was not permitted to possess the land, though, "By faith he sojourned in the land of promise, as in a strange country, dwelling in tabernacles with Isaac and Jacob, the heirs with him of the same promise: For he looked for a city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God."—Heb. xi. 9, 10. "By faith he saw the day of Christ and was glad."—John viii. 56. It was

that which was "reckoned to Abraham for righteousness." "And he received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had yet being uncircumcised: that he might be the father of all them that believe, though they be not circumcised; that righteousness might be imputed to them also."—Rom. iv. 9, 11.

Such was the everlasting purpose of God, in giving circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith Abraham had. Yet, he fixes that seal on the infant without faith. Therefore, it is for the rigid Baptists, who hold the everlasting purposes of God, to be fixed before the foundations of the world, to show us, when God repealed His everlasting covenant with Abraham, which embraces parent and child through faith, and by faith, as heirs of the same promise. Until they do this, we dare not change our faith and practice. For in so doing, we should be guilty of a breach of the covenant of God, and of breaking the seal He has affixed, as the token of His covenant. We feel persuaded, that anything contrary to the seal, that would embrace the infant in the Gospel covenant made with Abraham, would be a forgery, or counterfeit, imposed on the church without Divine authority, calculated to mislead the enquirer, and prove injurious to the general welfare of Zion.

Were we to follow up the history of the Jews, we should find the fulfilment of the promise, depended on the faith they exercised in the covenant God; "to whom sware he, that they should not enter into his rest, but to them that believed not? So we see, that they could not enter in because of unbelief."—Heb. iii. 18, 19. Moses, their great lawgiver, warned them of the consequences in departing from the covenants of God. "It shall come to pass, if thou wilt not hearken unto the voice of the Lord thy God, to observe to do all his commandments and his statutes which I command thee this day; that all these

curses shall come upon thee and overtake thee. The Lord shall bring a nation against thee from far, from the end of the earth as swift as the eagle flieth: a nation whose tongue thou shalt not understand; And he shall besiege thee in all thy gates, until thy high and fenced walls come down, wherein thou trustest throughout all thy land; and He shall besiege thee in all thy gates throughout all thy land, which the Lord thy God hath given thee. And thou shalt eat the fruit of thine own body, the flesh of thy sons and of thy daughters, which the Lord thy God hath given thee in the siege, and in the straitness, wherewith thine enemies shall distress thee: And the Lord shall scatter thee among all people, from one end of the earth even unto the other; and there thou shalt serve other gods, which neither thou nor thy fathers have known, even wood and stone."—Deut. xxviii. 15—64. All these curses came upon the Jews, because they would not hearken unto the prophet, who came to confirm the "covenant with many."—Deut. xviii. 18, 19, Dan. ix 27. "And when he was come near, he beheld the city, and wept over it, Saying, if thou hadst known, even thou, at least, in this thy day, the things which belong unto thy peace! but now they are hid from thine eyes. For the day shall come upon thee, and thine enemies shall cast a trench about thee, and compass thee round, and keep thee in on every side. O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets, and stonest them which are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not! Behold your house is left unto you desolate. Woe unto them that give suck in those days!"—Luke xix. 41, 43, Matt. xxiii. 37, 38.

What Moses had prophecied should be the consequence of unbelief, the Lord declares shall take place; and ere that generation passed away, all these things were ful-

filled. By "a nation from far, from the end of the earth;" and, "as swift as the eagle flieth," so did destruction come upon the Jews. Being compassed round by a wall, built by Titus the Roman general, and nothing being left in the straitness of the siege, as Moses had prophesied, so they fulfilled, by eating of "the fruit of their own body," the flesh of their own sons and daughters. Josephus, who was at the taking of Jerusalem, in his history of the Jews, relates a most unnatural circumstance which took place, of a rich woman who had come up to the feast, slaying her infant son because of the famine. "Snatching up her son, who was a child sucking at her breast, she said,—"O thou miserable infant! for whom shall I preserve thee in this war, this famine, and this sedition? As to the war with the Romans, if they preserve our lives, we must be slaves! This famine will also destroy us, even before that slavery comes upon us. Yet are these seditious rogues more terrible than both the other. Come on; be thou my food, and be thou a fury to these seditious varlets, and a by-word to the world, which is all that is now wanting to complete the calamities of the Jews." "As soon as she had said this, she slew her son; and then roasted him, and ate the one-half of him, and kept the other half by her concealed."* The same historian also informs us, that during the war, "ninety-seven thousand persons were carried captive; and such as were sold were very many, and the buyers very few." Thus, was fulfilled, what Moses had told them should befall them. [Deut. xxviii. 68.] During the whole siege, eleven hundred thousand persons perished by famine and sword, and the soldiers grew weary in killing them. And now, where once stood the temple, the glory of the nation, stands the mosque of the false

*Josephus' War, 6, Chap. iii.

prophet, as a memorial of God's wrath; when he caused "the sacrifice and the oblation to cease, and for the overspreading of abominations, made it desolate."—Dan. ix. 27. That "one stone was not left upon another." How truly were the words of our Lord verified. "And they shall fall by the edge of the sword, and shall be led away captive into all nations, and Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles, till the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled."—Luke xxi. 24. And, why all these calamities upon the Jews? But, because of their hardness of heart and unbelief, in trusting to the outward sign of the law for justification, saying within themselves, "Abraham is our Father," [John viii. 39.] yet they did not the works of Abraham, and now they are a scattered people among all nations. "They abound in Poland, in Holland, in Russia, and in Turkey. In Germany, Spain, Italy, France, and Britain, they are more thinly scattered. In Persia, China, and India, on the east and on the west of the Ganges, they are few in number among the heathen. They have trodden the snows of Siberia, and the sands of the burning desert; and the European traveller hears of their existence in regions which he cannot reach, even in the very interior of Africa, south of Timbuctoo. From Moscow to Lisbon, from Japan to Britain, from Borneo to Archangel, from Hindostan to Honduras, no inhabitant of any nation upon the earth would be known in all the intervening regions, but a Jew alone."* Thus, are they driven from the land of promise, and enjoy no more the service of the temple, as prophecied by Hosea; "the children of Israel shall abide many days without a king, and without a prince, and without a sacrifice, and without an image (or altar), and without an ephod (or priest to wear the ephod), and without teraphim (or divine manifestation):

* Keith on Prophecy, p. 76.

Afterward shall the children of Israel return, and seek the Lord their God, and David their king; and shall fear the Lord and his goodness in the latter days."—Hosea iii. 4, 5. Then the Lord will revive his "work in the midst of the years, in the midst of the years make known; in wrath remember mercy."—Hab. iii. 2. "I will make a full end of all the nations whither I have driven thee: but I will not make a full end of thee. For, lo, I will command, and I will sift the house of Israel among all nations, like as corn is sifted in a sieve, yet shall not the least grain fall upon the earth."—Jer. xlvi. 28, Amos ix. 9. Thus shall the Jews be restored, and "graffed into their own olive tree, if they abide not in unbelief, for God is able to graff them in again," [Rom. xi. 23, 24,] when they shall come to him believing "that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him."—Heb. xi. 6. However, this shall not be, "until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in."—Rom. xi. 25. Then they shall say, "Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord."—Luke xiii. 35. Then, "the ransomed of the Lord shall return, and come to Zion with songs and everlasting joy upon their heads: they shall obtain joy and gladness, and sorrow and sighing shall flee away."—Isaiah xxxv. 10. It would be superfluous to enter into any lengthened argument in favour of the Jews returning to possess the land, from which they have been driven; for it is enough for us to know, that all having the faith of Abraham, will look "for a city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God;" and will "desire a better country, that is, an heavenly: where God is not ashamed to be called their God: for he hath prepared for them a city."—Heb. xi. 10, 16. Therefore, they will not seek to go up to build again Jerusalem, or the temple to worship God, for "it shall come to pass in the last days,

that the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the tops of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills; and all nations shall flow unto it. And many people shall go and say, Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, to the house of the God of Jacob; and he shall teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths: they shall go, and seek the Lord their God. They shall ask their way to Zion with their faces thitherward, saying, Come, and let us join ourselves to the Lord in a perpetual covenant that shall not be forgotten." Isaiah ii. 2, 3; Jer. l. 4, 5. Then shall be accomplished, that which the Lord had spoken by his servant, Moses, "If any of thine be driven out unto the outmost parts of heaven, from thence will the Lord thy God gather thee, and from thence will he fetch thee. And the Lord thy God will circumcise thine heart, and the heart of thy seed, to love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, that thou mayest live."—Deut. xxx. 4, 6.

Here we have circumcision connected with the return of the Jews. A circumcision exactly corresponding with that taught by the apostle Paul. [Rom. ii. 28, 29.] A circumcision belonging to the everlasting gospel, which the Jews shall embrace, when they shall be constrained to say with their kinsman, and apostle to the Gentiles, "We are the circumcision which worship God in the spirit, and rejoice in Christ Jesus, and have no confidence in the flesh."—Phil. iii. 3. Making such a confession as this, they will maintain the covenant of circumcision as a perpetual ordinance in the Church, as designed to "teach, and represent a change of heart and life," though they received the sign in infancy. Then we may safely come to the conclusion, that as baptism is designed to teach, and represent the same change of heart and life, there is no more need of the circumcision

of the flesh, and, therefore, it is abolished for the more convenient mode of baptism designed for male and female. Are we asked for "direct proof?" We give it, from the authority of the apostle Paul: "For ye are all the children of God by faith in Jesus Christ. For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ. There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus. And if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise." Gal. iii. 26, 29. Hence, what a spiritual circumcision of the heart once did, baptism now does; seals them "heirs according to the promise." Therefore it matters not if the outward sign be administered to the infant or adult, for it is only by faith they become heirs with Abraham of the promise; and as circumcision was to be given to the stranger, so is baptism to be given to all, male or female, Jew or Gentile, bond or free. Such was the design of God when he gave the seal of his covenant to Abraham, which was not forgotten when our Lord was about to come into the world: for we read, "Zacharias was filled with the Holy Ghost," when John was circumcised, "and prophesied, saying, Blessed be the Lord God of Israel; for he hath visited and redeemed his people, And hath raised up an horn of salvation for us in the house of his servant David; As he spake by the mouth of his holy prophets, which have been since the world began: That we should be saved from our enemies, and from the hand of all that hate us; To perform the mercy promised to our fathers, and to remember his holy covenant; The oath which he sware to our father Abraham, That he would grant unto us, that we being delivered out of the hands of our enemies might serve him without fear, In holiness and righteousness before him, all the days of our life. And thou, child, shalt be called the

prophet of the Highest: for thou shalt go before the face of the Lord to prepare his ways."—Luke i. 67—76. Hence, the coming of John was identified with the coming of the Messiah—in preparing the way of the Lord—by the baptism of repentance, which baptism, though not Christian baptism, must necessarily be connected with it; as Chrysostom says, "It was as it were a bridge, which from the baptism of the Jews made a way to that of our Saviour."

Though there is no direct proof that John baptized children, we have positive evidence that they were acknowledged by the Old and New Testament dispensations, and that they shared along with their parents the blessings thereof. For, did not the compassion of our Lord reach them on more than one occasion: when he fed from his own hand in the desert great multitudes, including, "men, women, and children."—Matt. xiv. 21, xv. 38. And how solicitous he is that the little ones should be cared for, when he affectionately embraces them, lays his hands upon them and blesses them, saying, "Suffer little children, and forbid them not, to come unto me: for of such is the kingdom of heaven."—Matt. xix. 14. At another time, "he took a child, and set him in the midst of them: and when he had taken him in his arms, he said unto them, Whosoever shall receive one of such children in my name, receiveth me: and whosoever shall receive me, receiveth not me, but him that sent me."—Mark ix. 36, 37. Some, no doubt, will tell us, that our Lord only placed the child before his disciples as a type of humility, and, therefore, was only a figurative way of instructing his disciples. But, can it be possible, that he who had created the living type, should object to that type on account of its unconciousness, when he knew the object for which they were brought unto him; "that he should put his hands on them, and pray."—Matt. xix. 13. And, if he rebuked them not, would he

refuse to pray for them, when "he blessed them, and laid his hands on them?" Surely not! for if the prayer of the righteous availeth much, so would the prayer of our Lord, accompanied with his divine blessing, be effectual on behalf of the child. Here we have our authority for our faith and practice; having a "THUS SAITH THE LORD," we dare not shrink from our practice in dedicating the child to God, and "baptizing it in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost;" because "it is written in the law of the Lord, every male that openeth the womb, shall be called holy to the Lord."—Luke ii. 23. This law was not abolished, but continued in the gospel dispensation; or why should the apostle Paul tell us, "the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the husband: else were your children unclean; but now are they holy."—1 Cor. vii. 14. In what sense these children of the believing Corinthians were holy we cannot understand, unless they were sanctified, or set apart by baptism, when "they were presented to the Lord."—Luke ii. 22. Such being the case, we must continue in the apostolic faith and practice, in admitting infants to baptism, and thus set them apart for God.

"Then let the children of the saints,
Be dedicate to God;
Pour out thy Spirit on them, Lord,
And wash them in thy blood.

Thus to the parents and their seed,
Shall thy salvation come;
And numerous households meet at last,
In one eternal home."

Those who object to infant baptism, can only do so by setting aside the perpetuity of the Abrahamic covenant. Thus, Mr. PRICE labours to nullify the arguments of the apostle Paul, when addressing the Galatian Church;

"Brethren, I speak after the manner of men; though it be but a man's covenant, yet if it be confirmed, no man disannulleth, or addeth thereto. Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, and unto seeds, as of many: but as of one, and to thy seed which is Christ. And this I say, that the covenant, that was confirmed before of God in Christ, the law, which was four hundred and thirty years after, cannot disannul, that it should make the promise of none effect."—Gal. iii. 15—17. Mr. PRICE says, page 4;* "If scripture chronology is worth anything, it was not 430 years from the covenant of circumcision, referred to by Mr. L., to the giving of the law. The one was B.C. 1898, the other B.C. 1491, so that the time between these two was only 407 years." The covenant of which the apostle speaks, [Gal. iii. 17.] which the law, being 430 years after, could not disannul, is evidently not the covenant of circumcision, but a manifestation of the covenant of grace given to Abraham twenty-three years before the covenant of circumcision. [*see* Gen. xii. 1, 3.] We need not say a word in defence of what has been advanced in *Infant Baptism Scripturally Defended* on the covenant of circumcision, for the apostle plainly tells us, that Abraham "received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had yet being uncircumcised: that he might be the father of all them that believe, though they be not circumcised."—Rom. iv. 11. Therefore, the sign of circumcision had to do with the faith Abraham had, twenty-three years previous to his receiving the sign, and also had to do with the same promise given to Isaac and Jacob. If God was pleased to defer the sign, until twenty-three years after the promise to Abraham, and, on more than one occasion, give him the same promise, after he had received the

* Infant Baptism Scripturally Refuted.

sign, [*see* Gen. xii. 3, xvii. 5—20, xviii. 17, 19, xxii. 16, 18, xxvi. 4.] it does not effect the covenant that it should become null and void, but confirms the faith, and establishes the covenant of grace as an "everlasting covenant."—Gen. xvii. 7. That Abraham "might be the father of all them that believe, though they be not circumcised; that righteousness might be imputed unto them also: and the father of circumcision to them who are not of the circumcision only, but who also walk in the steps of that faith of our father Abraham, which he had being yet uncircumcised."—Rom. iv. 11, 12. Here we have believers in Christ, called the children of Abraham; having the same faith he had, for which he received the sign of circumcision: therefore, circumcision must be connected with the gospel dispensation, or there must be some other "seal of the righteousness of the faith" we now have, as a substitute for circumcision. Then, if we take baptism as that substitute, we cannot be far wrong, seeing, that those who differ with us on baptism, admit "it is true, that circumcision and baptism both teach and represent a change of heart and life;" so that, if Abraham gave circumcision to the infant, without faith, we may safely follow in the same course, and give baptism to the infant, both being designed to teach the same thing. Therefore it is absurd, and altogether contrary to the reasoning of the apostle, to introduce twenty-three years of delay between the promise and the seal, as an argument against the perpetuity of the covenant of circumcision; especially from those, who, above all men, ought to know that God is not confined to twenty-three years to effect his purposes: seeing, "that one day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day."—2 Peter, iii. 8.

Because we have contended for the continuance of the covenant given to Abraham, in the Christian Church,

we are charged with "the very Judaizing spirit, which hindered the Galatian Church from running well." But, having carefully examined the writings of the apostle Paul, we have nothing to retract, but much to strengthen our faith in the perpetuity of the covenant given to Abraham: for can it be possible, that the apostle who circumcised Timothy, [Acts xvi. 3.] in so doing, acted contrary to his own teachings, or violated any principle? when he says, "circumcision verily profiteth if thou keep the law: but if thou be a breaker of the law, thy circumcision is made uncircumcision."—Rom. ii. 25, 29. Then it is not in the letter that we are to understand circumcision, but in the spirit, because he who may be circumcised in the flesh, may be a "breaker of the law," and uncircumcised in heart. Therefore we have done no more than the apostle, in maintaining a spiritual circumcision; "For we through the Spirit wait for the hope of righteousness by faith. For in Jesus Christ neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision, but faith which worketh by love."—Gal. v. 5, 6. Hence, the circumcision of the flesh is not essential to the fulfilling of the covenant, but is left open, which justifies Paul in circumcising Timothy. But when the Galatians used "their liberty for an occasion to the flesh," then the apostle speaks out:—"Behold, I Paul say unto you, that if you be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing. For I testify again to every man that is circumcised, that he is a debtor to do the whole law. Christ is become of no effect unto you, whosoever of you are justified by the law; ye are fallen from grace."—Gal. v. 2—4. This is the error into which the Galatian Church had fallen—justification by works: trusting in the circumcision of the flesh as a means of salvation: and teaching a doctrine of men. "Except ye be circumcised after the manner

of Moses, ye cannot be saved. Ye must be circumcised and keep the law."—Acts xv. 1, 24. Of which doctrine Peter was not free at Antioch, for Paul "withstood him to the face, because he was to be blamed."—Gal. ii. 11, 16. Such a doctrine is being taught in the present day—namely, Baptismal Regeneration, a trusting to the outward sign for justification and salvation—developing itself in different denominations of professing Christians, not exempting rigid Baptists; for if what we have given us, in *Infant Baptism Scripturally Refuted*, be a specimen of the faith of that denomination, we have Baptismal Regeneration taught, not only in theory, but in practice, inasmuch as the author of that pamphlet sets it down as sound doctrine, that baptism is "the means of giving the answer of a good conscience toward God;" of course, omitting "not the putting away of the filth of the flesh," for this does away with the outward sign having anything to do with "giving the answer of a good conscience toward God." The baptism which the apostle speaks of is entirely of a spiritual character, having nothing to do with the flesh; or why "the like figure whereunto baptism doth now save us?" The apostle was evidently giving a figure of the past, which was the means of salvation through faith alone. But on taking the Baptists' translation of this passage, we find that the sense is changed, as having to do with the baptism of the body, and, in consequence, is the "means of giving the answer of a good conscience toward God"—then the Baptist translation will read thus, "the like figure whereunto *dipping* doth also now save us."

Now, there can be no *dipping* of the soul; yet, if we are to take the Baptist translation as "the truth," then we have a salvation by *dipping*. Hence, the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration is fully established, which is contrary to the sense in which the apostle is to be

understood, when he says, "not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God, by the resurrection of Jesus Christ."—1 Peter, iii. 21. Therefore this baptism cannot have to do with the flesh, but with the Spirit, in sprinkling "the heart from an evil conscience."—Heb. x. 22. Again, were we to practice *dipping*, we should give an undue prominence to works, when faith should take the precedence, as the only means of justification. It was this that hindered the Galatian Church from running well; that they "should not obey the truth," concerning which the apostle questions them; "This only would I learn of you, received ye the Spirit by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith? Are ye so foolish? having begun in the Spirit, are ye now made perfect by the flesh? For I testify again to every man that is circumcised, that he is a debtor to do the whole law. Christ is become of no effect unto you, whosoever of you are justified by the law; ye are fallen from grace." Gal. iii. 1, 3, v. 3, 4. Then if baptism and circumcision were designed to teach "a change of heart and life," they must be equal, so far as regards the law. And, if *dipping*, which Baptists say is Christian baptism, be essential to church fellowship and salvation, as we have seen from their own translation, they are chargeable with the same Judaizing spirit so manifest in the Galatian Church. "Therefore thou art inexcusable, O man, whosoever thou art that judgest: for wherein thou judgest another, thou condemnest thyself; for thou that judgest doest the same things."—Rom. ii. 1. Then let us hear no more of *dipping* being "the truth," as though "the truth" was confined to the narrow limits of the baptistry; "For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature."—Gal. vi. 15. So is it with baptism. "Where

is boasting then? it is excluded. By what law? Of works? Nay: but by the law of faith; Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith, without the deeds of the law."—Rom. iii. 27, 28. This was no new doctrine taught by the apostle, but one that must be known to the Jews, if they understood the law and the prophets; for Jeremiah more than 600 years before had prophesied,—"Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will punish all them which are circumcised with the uncircumcised; Egypt, and Judah, and Edom, and the children of Ammon, and Moab, and all that are in the utmost corners, that dwell in the wilderness: for all these nations are uncircumcised, and all the house of Israel are uncircumcised in the heart."—Jer. ix. 25, 26. Here we have a "THUS SAITH THE LORD," that the outward sign was never intended to distinguish his people from the idolatrous nations of the earth, but all are placed on an equality when they are destitute of the vital principle of godliness, namely, circumcision, or the baptism of the heart, which alone can distinguish the people of God, and seal them heirs "according to the promise." Then let us hold fast the beginning of our confidence, and be no more "tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men, and cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive,"—Ephesians iv. 14.

SECOND.—*Infant Baptism, practised by the Jews, a sufficient guarantee for the continuance of the same in the Christian Church.*

GOD at all times has given manifestations of his love towards children, and has commanded that they shall be cared for, and trained to walk in his ways. Hence, Moses addressed Israel—"Hear, O Israel: The Lord

our God is one Lord: And thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might. And these words which I command thee this day, shall be in thine heart: and thou shalt teach them diligently unto thy children, and shalt talk of them when thou sittest in thine house, and when thou walkest by the way, and when thou liest down, and when thou risest up."—Deut. vi. 4—7. Here is a "THUS SAITH THE LORD," that children shall be instructed in the first principles of the service ordained by God in his church; a service that was not intended for the synagogue, or temple alone, but for the domestic circle, "when thou sittest in thine house." The youthful mind was constantly to be exercised in the commandments of God, that the outward sign of the covenant might be turned to a spiritual account, so as to understand the nature of that service God requires. "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might." In teaching this, we teach an important truth to the child, that of love and obedience commanded by God. Thus parent and child are to be interested in the service of God by the same process of teaching, and receiving the commandments of God in the heart, which unquestionably is what our Lord intended, when he commanded his disciples, saying, "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world."—Matt. xxviii. 19, 20. This is Christian baptism, designed for infants and adults. But, say the Baptists, "you must teach them first!" And so say we, when the gospel is, for the first time, preached to an idolatrous nation, for we cannot expect them to receive baptism

until they shall have some knowledge of the nature and design of that ordinance. Then they will admit their children to baptism. Thus adults will be taught previous to baptism, and infants after baptism, which is all that is required in the command, when we compare Matthew xxviii. 19, 20, where our Lord tells his disciples in the nineteenth verse, to teach all nations before baptism, and in the twentieth verse, to teach them after baptism. Hence, children must be included, since we know of no nation existing without them. Therefore it would be more to the purpose if our Baptist friends, who are so tenacious about teaching before baptism, would baptize the children they teach, and not require of them what the commission does not demand. In this they go beyond what is required in the commission, by demanding faith in all cases as essential to baptism—thus making baptism of primary importance, and equal to the salvation of the soul. "THUS SAITH THE LORD,"—"He that believeth on him is not condemned: but he that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God."—John iii. 18. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." Mark xvi. 16. It is impossible for children to exercise this faith. Therefore if faith be essential to baptism, and infants are refused the ordinance because they have not that faith, so in like manner they must be refused salvation, because they have not the faith that is necessary. Then we ask, how will the Baptist, having lost his child in infancy (believing that it has gone to heaven), reconcile his practice with his faith, in denying to that child that which is not essential to salvation, because it had not faith, when he believes it has obtained salvation without faith? Surely, after calm reflection, he must come to the conclusion, that when our Lord

commanded his disciples to baptize all nations, he included children in the commission, as infant baptism had been for ages practised in the Jewish Church. This we have from the apostle Paul, when he says,—"Moreover, brethren, I would not that ye should be ignorant, how that all our fathers were under the cloud, and all passed through the sea; And were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea."—1 Cor. x. 1, 2. Here the apostle speaks not only of a few, but all were baptized unto Moses; infants and adults, for all alike "were under the cloud, and all passed through the sea." Then "all were baptized unto Moses in the cloud, and in the sea."

Some, however, will object to the baptism of these infants, on the ground of their unconsciousness and incapability of exercising faith; because the apostle says, "our fathers were under the cloud, and all passed through the sea." But were we to take this only to prove who "were baptized unto Moses," we should do it to the disparagement of other portions of scripture. Therefore it is only by comparing the Old Testament with the New Testament Scripture, that we learn, and are able to prove, that infants were baptized along with their parents. When the children of Israel were about to depart from Egypt, it is said, "Moses and Aaron were brought again unto Pharoah: and he said unto them, Go, serve the Lord your God: but who are they that shall go? And Moses said, We will go with our young and with our old, with our sons and with our daughters, with our flocks and with our herds will we go; for we must hold a feast unto the Lord. And he said unto them, Let the Lord be so with you, as I will let you go, and your little ones; look to it; for evil is before you."—Exodus x. 8—10. Here we have sufficient proof that infants were included in the number who

passed through the sea, and were baptized unto Moses. But the rigid Baptist will tell us, "that none have a right to the ordinance of baptism, unless they are made partakers of the Holy Ghost." Hence the children of the Jews are excluded from the baptism spoken of by Moses, "in the cloud and in the sea." This same people, holding high Calvinistic doctrines, say, "baptism ought only to be administered to the believer, or the elect." These are only assertions, without a scriptural foundation whereon to stand; for when tested by the word of God, we are able to discover their shallowness, and prove that they are not of God, but of men. For these people must admit, according to their own faith in the doctrine of election, that the apostle in directing his epistle to the church at Corinth, addressed the elect of God. And when he reminded them of their fathers being baptized unto Moses "in the cloud and in the sea," they will also admit, that the apostle only spake of the *elect* being baptized unto Moses. But, when we examine the character of these people, we find their hardness of heart and unbelief prevailed, so as to hinder them from inheriting the promises; "they could not enter in because of unbelief."—Rom. iii. 19. Therefore there is no alternative for the rigid Baptist, but to believe they were not of the elect; so that if the apostle spake only of adults being baptized, then these unbelievers "were baptized unto Moses," but if he spake of the elect, as these Baptists would have us particularly to keep in mind, then he evidently included children, for they entered into the promised land, and were the fathers of those who possessed it; and if they were baptized unto Moses, it was "in the cloud and in the sea," when they were infants, for these are they, whom God permitted to enter into rest, but rejected the adult, when he said, "Moreover your little ones, which ye said should be a

prey, and your children, which in that day had no knowledge between good and evil, they shall go in thither, and unto them will I give it, and they shall possess it. But as for you, turn you, and take your journey into the wilderness by the way of the Red sea."—Deut. i. 39, 40. Hence we conclude that Moses baptized infants and adults, which the apostle confirms, and the faith of the rigid Baptist establishes: "that the purpose of God according to election might stand."—Rom. ix. 11. However inconsistent their faith may be with their practice, they must admit the baptism of these elect children "unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea." That baptism was known and practised among the Jews is evident; for when "Nicodemus came to Jesus by night, and said unto him, Rabbi, we know that thou art a teacher come from God: for no man can do these miracles that thou doest except God be with him. Jesus answered, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God. * * * Nicodemus answered and said unto him how can these things be? Jesus answered and said unto him, Art thou a master in Israel and knowest not these things?"—John iii. 2—10. This question at once suggests, that Jesus was setting forth no new doctrine, but a doctrine well known to those who "waited for the consolation of Israel," although Nicodemus, a master in Israel, displayed so much ignorance concerning its truth. If there had been no such doctrine taught among the Jews, it would have been superfluous to put the question, "Art thou a master in Israel and knowest not these things?" Therefore it must follow, that the same doctrine taught in the Jewish Church, is retained in the Christian Church. "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." We are aware

that some have used this to prove their Baptismal Regeneration, as a means of sanctification and acceptance with God, which is in direct opposition to other portions of scripture. Thus, relying upon baptism for regeneration, "they wrest the scriptures unto their own destruction," [2 Peter, iii. 16.] for it is "not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God," by which the believer feels himself to be regenerated and accepted by God.

Dr. HALLEY, in his Work on the Sacraments,* gives the following valuable citations from the Babylonian *Talmud:*—"If with a proselyte, his sons and daughters be made proselytes, that which is done by their father redounds to their good." The *Mishna* speaks of a proselyte of three years old, which is thus explained in the *Gemara:*—"They are accustomed to baptize a proselyte in infancy upon the approval of the consistory, for this is for his good." From the *Gloss:*—They are accustomed to baptize, if he have not a father and his mother bring him to be proselyted, because none is made a proselyte without circumcision or baptism." From *Maimonides:*—An Israelite that takes a little child, or that finds a heathen infant, and baptizes him for a proselyte, behold he is a proselyte! The person who baptizes the infant, acts towards him the part of a father." From LIGHTFOOT:—"The baptizing of infants had been a thing as commonly known and as commonly used, before John's coming and to the very time of his coming, as any holy thing that was used among the Jews; and they were as well acquainted with infants' baptism, as they were with infants' circumcision." After giving these citations, Dr. H. proceeds—"I have said no better testimony is to be obtained; let it be added

*A Work well worth the attention of all Baptists; full of argument, sound judgment, displaying much learning, and Christian candour.

that there is no contradictory testimony whatsoever. Neither Josephus, nor Philo, nor the ancient Targums, supply any information upon the subject. Both Talmuds agree, the Glosses correspond, and Maimonides, the great interpreter of the Jewish law, confirms and elucidates the Talmudists. Tried by every test we can apply, the rabbinical writings give a true account of the traditionary customs which prevailed in the time of our Lord. The practice of infant proselytes was certainly the practice of the Jews when the Talmuds were composed. The writers must have known the customs of their own nation. These rabbins were themselves the great authorities of their age; and their writings, surely in accordance with their own practice, must have regulated the practice of the whole nation." Seeing we have such evidence as this, we cannot close our eyes to the fact of infants being baptized by the Jews, nor can we believe, that John's baptism did not include children, inasmuch as the Jews were commanded to set every thing apart by sprinkling, whether animate or inanimate, therefore it is not likely that children were excluded. [Lev. xiv. 7, 52.] It is indeed true, that the New Testament is silent concerning John baptizing infants, but does that silence prove that he did not baptize them? If it proves anything at all, it proves that he did baptize them, in accordance with the law, and the custom of the age. So that, when our Lord gave his disciples the commission, to "Go and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost," it was unquestionably understood by the disciples, that children were included, or a new law would have been required, contrary to the custom of the Jews in baptizing children. And, because we ask for this, we are told by a Baptist minister, from the pulpit, "It is just saying, that the Lord had not

sense enough to make a law."* This requires no comment, for if we agree on the change of the Sabbath, and the admission of females to the Lord's Supper, from custom, without a direct law,† in like manner we ought to agree on what was customary, prior to Christian baptism, in the baptism of infants, without a direct law also. Therefore, Baptists ought to allow us to adopt the same line of argument, to prove the baptism of infants from the command of our Lord, which they adopt to prove that for which they have not always a "THUS SAITH THE LORD."

Christian Baptism, according to the apostle Paul, is one of "the first principles of the oracles of God," intended for the "babe" who "is unskilfull in the word of righteousness, But strong meat belongeth to them that are of full age, even those by reason of use have their senses exercised to discern both good and evil."—Heb. v. 12—14. Here we have the apostle telling us in unmistakeable language, that the "first principles of Christian doctrine are for those who have not their senses exercised to discern good and evil." Therefore baptism was never intended for the man of full age, when he has come to that perfection of which the apostle speaks; for it is then that he must partake of strong meat, and so leave "the principles of the doctrine of Christ," and "go on unto perfection; not laying again the foundation of repentance from dead works, and of faith toward God, Of the doctrine of baptisms, and of laying on of hands, and of resurrection of the dead, and of eternal judgment."—Heb. vi. 1, 2. These forming the basis of Christian instruction, it is evident they were designed for those whose "senses have not been exercised, so as to discern good from evil." [*see* Heb.

* Sermon preached in a rigid Baptist Chapel, Manchester.—*April*, 1855.

† "Were Christ's disciples baptized."—*J. C. Philpots.*

v. 14, Deut. i. 39.] If it were not so, the apostle would write in vain to the Ephesians, "ye fathers provoke not your children to wrath: but bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord."—Eph. vi. 4. Hence the children of believers are to be "trained up in the way they should go," and educated in the principles of the doctrine of Christ; the first of which is baptism, when they are dedicated to the Lord. But Baptists set aside this mode of instruction, as having nothing to do with the child, simply because its senses have not been "exercised to discern both good and evil." Then who are we to believe? the inspired writer, or they who retain these principles for the adults, whose "senses are exercised to discern both good and evil?" We dare not set aside the inspired word, to receive the doctrines of men; for baptism never was designed exclusively for the believer, and, therefore, children are the subjects of baptism. Are we told to examine the character of those whom John baptized? To this we have not the least objection, for in doing so, we read, "Then said he to the multitude that came forth to be baptized of him, O generation of vipers, who hath warned you to flee from the wrath to come."—Matt. iii. 7—12, Luke iii. 7—17. Pharisees and Sadducees, publicans and sinners, came to be baptized of John in Jordan. But were they baptized by John? the Baptist will be ready to ask. Let John speak for himself: "I indeed have baptized you with water: but he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost."—Mark i. 8. It is true that John preached the baptism of repentance, and the people "were baptized of him in Jordan, confessing their sins," but this is no reason why the Baptists should make so much of this confession of sins, as necessary to baptism—having no evidence that these people repented of their sins. "For godly sorrow worketh repentance to salvation

not to be repented of: but the sorrow of the world worketh death."—2 Cor. vii. 10. If the Jews repented at all after their baptism, it was such that was to be repented of, in rejecting the Messiah, of whom John testified, saying, "one mightier than I cometh, the latchet of whose shoes I am not worthy to unloose: he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire." Luke iii. 16. Had the Jews believed this, they no doubt would have repented, but all evidence that can be gathered proves to the contrary; for John tells them, "I indeed baptize you with water unto repentance," not *into* repentance. Therefore John baptized prior to repentance, at the same time exhorting them, to "Bring forth fruits worthy of repentance."—Luke iii. 8. So that he could not admit of baptism as "a door into the church," for they were already connected with the Jewish Church; neither did he give them baptism simply because they confessed their sins, for that would be admitting the Romish doctrines of Auricular Confession, and Absolution. Thus the rigid Baptist must see the folly of maintaining his arguments in favour of believers' baptism, as a door into the church, from the practice of John. Indeed, there is nothing in the New Testament favourable to such a conclusion. For, THUS SAITH THE LORD, "I am the door, by me if any man enter in, he shall be saved, and shall go in, and out and find pasture."—John x. 9. Then it is by faith we enter in, and it is by faith we are saved, and not by works; for we might as well believe that Christ is literally a door, as believe that baptism is a door. But the more we maintain of the Spirit, the less we shall have of the carnal, either in the baptism of water, or the emblems of the broken body of our Lord, for there is only one door into the church, and that by faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. If Baptists will transfer the door of the

church from Christ, to the ordinance of baptism, it is for them to show us the power of transfer, for, until then, we must submit to what he himself has said—"by me if any man enter in he shall be saved," and so stand aloof from the door of the Baptist Church. Were we to admit baptism to be the "door into the church," we should also admit that by passing through that door, we should be saved, and so acknowledge the Popish doctrine of no salvation outside the pale of "the church." Then are we surprised that these strict communionists should have no fellowship with publicans and sinners, because they have not passed through their door, or been washed in the baptistry, before they sit at the table prepared by the Lord? [Matt. xv. 2.] Alas! for such an extension of the Pharisaical doctrine, that would compel us not only to wash our hands, but our whole body before we eat. It is not by this that we are distinguished as the disciples of Christ. "By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another."—John xiii. 35. When this is the ruling principle in the church, all bigotry and party spirit will be subdued, and the different sections of the church of Christ unite together, in one bond of Christian brotherhood, to show forth the death of the Lord until he come.

But in passing on we observe, that Christ in the course of his ministry admitted none into his church through baptism, neither is it said they were believers that he baptized. It is true that he baptized more disciples than John, and it is also true that "many of his disciples went back and walked no more with him."—John vi. 66. Such were they whom Christ baptized, at once proving that he never intended baptism to be given to the believer, or elect only; yet Mr. KERSHAW says,* "none have a right to the ordinance of baptism, unless they are made

* Gospel Standard.

partakers of the Holy Ghost." If this be true, then Christ ought not (according to Mr. K.) to have baptized the multitude, there being no evidence that they were made partakers of the Holy Ghost; "for the Holy Ghost was not given; because that Jesus was not yet glorified." John vii. 39. Then, if Mr. KERSHAW preaches "the truth," Christ and the apostles are charged with heresy, because they baptized before the candidates had received the Holy Ghost; for it is clear that Christ baptized his disciples with water, prior to their receiving the Holy Ghost. Or why should he promise to send the Comforter, if they were already in possession? [John xiv. 26.] Or why should he say to them, "ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence," [Acts i. 5.] if they had previously received that baptism? Precisely upon the same principle, the apostles went out to baptize the nations, according to the Lord's command. When Philip preached the "things concerning the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized both men and women," without any sign of the Holy Ghost being given; for it is written, "Now when the apostles which were at Jerusalem heard that Samaria had received the word of God, they sent unto them Peter and John: Who, when they were come down, prayed for them, that they might receive the Holy Ghost: (For as yet he was fallen upon none of them only they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus.) Then they laid their hands on them, and they received the Holy Ghost." But there was one Simon, who believed and was baptized, to whom it was said, "Thou hast neither part nor lot in this matter: for thy heart is not right in the sight of God." Yet what Philip did in Samaria, the apostles approved in Jerusalem, by sending Peter and John. Paul was not then called to be an apostle, and, therefore, took no part in the council at Jerusalem;

but when at Ephesus, he found certain disciples, and "He said unto them, Have ye received the Holy Ghost since ye believed? And they said unto him, We have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost. And he said unto them, Unto what then were ye baptized? And they said, Unto John's baptism. Then said Paul, John verily baptized with the baptism of repentance, saying unto the people, that they should believe on him which should come after him, that is, on Christ Jesus. When they heard this, they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus. And when Paul had laid his hands upon them, the Holy Ghost came on them; and they spake with tongues, and prophecied. And all the men were about twelve."—Acts xix. 2—7. Here we have an account of twelve men being first baptized by John the Baptist, and afterwards by the apostle Paul, previous to their receiving the gift of the Holy Ghost; thus proving that Mr. KERSHAW has no "THUS SAITH THE LORD," and the example of the apostles, for his faith and practice.

Mr. PRICE, in page 14, says, "It is to be feared that Mr. L., when reading the Bible, is very careless about comparing scripture with scripture, so as to understand the meaning of apparantly contradictory portions. Thus we find him contending for the entire ignorance of the disciples at Ephesus, [Acts xix. 1—6.] with respect to the existence and personality of the Holy Ghost; and he represents them as being baptized a second time. A strange idea, indeed, to suppose that men called "disciples" should be ignorant of such an essential point of doctrine. Now, according to the confession of these disciples, they had been baptized "unto John's baptism." Bear in mind, therefore, that the baptism of the Holy Ghost by Christ, was what John plainly pointed out in his ministry. 'He that cometh after

me is mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to bear; he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire;' [Matt. iii. 11.] so that they must have heard of the Holy Ghost though living at a distance from Jerusalem." Had Mr. PRICE taken the sacred records as his standard of faith, he would not have said "Mr. L. represents them as being baptized a second time," but he would have taken the record as it is given, which distinctly states, they were baptized "in the name of the Lord Jesus." Probably Mr. P. would like this erased from the book altogether, because he does not like the representation of these disciples being baptized a second time without receiving the Holy Ghost before baptism; for it must be a "strange idea" to those whose practice is so very different to that of the apostles, in baptizing those only who say they have received the Holy Ghost, and, therefore, are the elect. But these twelve men said, "We have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost;" and yet Mr. P. says "they must have heard of the Holy Ghost." Then who are we to believe? If we believe Mr. PRICE, we damage the reputation of the sacred records; so that we must come to the conclusion, that Mr. PRICE has fallen into the same error as Mr. KERSHAW, in contradicting the inspired word, and a man who will be guilty of this, will never be very particular in searching and comparing the scriptures to establish their truth. Again, the re-baptism of these twelve men teaches us, that the baptism of John was not Christian baptism, inasmuch, as John taught his disciples, "that they should believe on him which should come after him, that is, on Christ Jesus." Paul preached to these disciples Christ as having come. "When they heard this, they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus" and hence arose the necessity of receiving Christian baptism; so that the difference

between these baptisms did not consist in the application of the rite, but in that they were designed to teach. This will lead us to notice the nature of faith required by the apostles in order to baptism.

Our Baptist friends often bring before us Acts viii. 36, 37, "See here is water, what doth hinder me to be baptized? And Philip said, If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest. And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God." Philip had just come up from Samaria, where he had "baptized both men and women," who had not received the gift of the Holy Ghost. Therefore it is not likely he would demand from the eunuch a different faith to that professed by the Samaritans, that is, to "believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God." This was the faith Peter had, when he said, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God;" it was the faith for which our Lord prayed that it fail not, though Peter was yet unconverted; [Matt. xxii. 32.] it was the faith of those whom Paul baptized at Ephesus; it is the faith thousands have in our day; yet, have only the form of godliness but deny the power thereof; yea, and it may be added, "devils also believe and tremble."—James ii. 19. Then if such be the faith professed by all those whom Christ and the apostles baptized, why should Baptists ask for more? in demanding that faith by which we know we are the children of God. [Gal. iii. 26.] Had baptism been designed only for such, then those who are finally saved are the subjects of baptism; but when we find our Lord, who knew the hearts of all men, baptizing those of whom it is said, "many of his disciples went back, and walked no more with him," of such, it cannot be said they believed to the saving of the soul, yet they were subjects of baptism. Therefore, baptism was not intended to be given to the elect exclusively, but to all who believed

"that Jesus Christ is the Son of God." Such being the nature of faith required by Christ and the apostles, we may safely conclude, that they would not refuse infants the rite of baptism, who were to be brought up "in the nurture and admonition of the Lord," according to the faith professed by their parents. This will account for the many households baptized by the apostles, without distinction of age, which is in strict accordance with the Old Testament, by which the faith and practice of the early Christians was established, "in that they received the word with all readiness of mind, and searched the scriptures daily, whether those things were so."—Acts xvii. 11. Thus, knowing that circumcision and baptism were designed to teach the same thing, they could not be ignorant of the practice of the Jews, in receiving proselytes according to the scriptures. Therefore they would baptize proselytes with their children according to the custom of the Jews, in circumcising all the males of the stranger, before he partook of the passover: "when a stranger shall sojourn with thee, and will keep the passover to the Lord, let all his males be circumcised, and then let him come near and keep it; and he shall be as one that is born in the land: for no uncircumcised person shall eat thereof."—Exodus xii. 48. It was enough that the head of the household should make a profession of faith; that he should "command his children and his household after him, to keep the way of the Lord, to do justice and judgment." Gen. xviii. 19. Thus Joshua spake for his house; "as for me and my house, we will serve the Lord."—Joshua xxiv. 15. And in comparing the Old Testament with the New Testament, we find the practice to be the same in the case of the Philippian jailer, when he was told to "believe on the Lord Jesus Christ. He and all his were baptized straitway." The same may be said of

Lydia and her household, when the word was preached unto them by the river side, all were baptized, though there is evidence of only one believing "what was spoken of by Paul." Thus did the great apostle of the Gentiles baptize households on the spot, immediately after they had heard the word preached, without any preparation or delay in order to inquire into the nature of their faith.

Thus, baptism was administered by the apostles at any time, and in any place; be it in the prison, by the river side, or in the house of Cornelius, without any inconvenience whatever, and according to their own discretion. Therefore, they did not use baptism as a door into the church, not having consulted the members thereof concerning the propriety of receiving such as had given no evidence of their faith in the Lord Jesus, previous to the time of their baptism, so that we must again be permitted to say, that the practice of our Baptist friends differs greatly from the practice of the apostles. Again, if the apostles baptized such as were not to be recommended to the church, through their baptism, we may safely conclude that they would baptize children, they being included in the households—especially in the case of the jailer; "He and all his being baptized." But, if there should be any objection to this, because it is not distinctly stated that children were included in these households, which Mr. PRICE admits when he says, page 12, "It is no wonder that, in the absence of any direct proof, men should lay hold of any thing which seems to contain a possibility that infants were baptized." Now, it is not with that "which seems to have a possibility," but that which *has* a possibility, with which we have to do; for, if we have no direct proof for our practice, in the few passages selected, we must search the scriptures and compare them, that we may understand the sense in which house and household are to be

understood. And, in doing so, we find these terms are used in the scriptures about 1,400 times, having the following significations:—1st. A place to dwell in. [Gen. xix. 3.] 2nd. The household, or persons dwelling in the house. [Acts ii. 10.] 3rd. Kindred, stock, or lineage. [2 Sam. vii. 18.] 4th. Wealth, riches, or estates. [Matt. xxiii. 14.] 5th. The grave, or sepulchre. [Job xxx. 23.] 6th. Men's family affairs and concerns. [2 Kings, xx. 1.] 7th. This frail, corruptible, mortal body, wherein the soul lodges for a time. [2 Cor. v. 1.] 8th. The church among the Jews. [Heb. iii. 2, John xiv. 2.] These being the various significations by which we are to understand the meaning of the terms house and household, and there being no distinction of old and young, but all being included as forming the household, we must take the scriptures as they are to be understood in their general bearing, when we can get nothing more definite, and believe that infants were included in the households baptized by the apostles. This is confirmed by the writings of the Fathers, which Mr. PRICE does not deny, but proves, when he says, "Dr. GILL was well acquainted with the writings of the Fathers, indeed he had read them all; consequently he may be regarded as good authority on this subject." From him he gives the following—"Antiquity is urged in favour of infant baptism. * * * * No mention is made of this practice in the first two centuries, no instance given of it until the third, when Tertullian is the first who spoke of it, and at the same time spoke against it." If it be true, that "No mention is made of this practice in the first two centuries," what is to be done with the writings of Irenæus and Justin Martyr, who wrote about forty years after the apostles, both giving evidence that "infants, little ones, youths and elderly persons," were made disciples "to Christ;" and some of these, who

were then "sixty and seventy years old, were made disciples to Christ from their childhood." Therefore they must have been made disciples in the apostles time, and, if disciples, they were baptized. From these two Fathers we learn, that children were baptized at least thirty years before the apostle John died, so that if it had been a practice contrary to the command of our Lord, John certainly would have condemned it in his epistles. Again, we have Cyprian in the second century, presiding at a council convened at Carthage, when it was unanimously resolved, that the baptism of infants ought not to be deferred to the eighth day, but might be given them any day before. "A letter to this purpose was written and signed by Cyprian, in the name of the council," in reply to "a question started by one Fidus."* Then, if Dr. GILL had read all the Fathers, he must have known that such a council had been convened, and the decision they came to, long before Tertullian objected to infant baptism; which objection establishes the truth, that infants were baptized, and received as subjects thereof. Dr. GILL, when writing, left out another objection Tertullian had to the baptism of unmarried persons; so that he not only objected to infant baptism, but adult

* So far as respects the matter of infants, concerning whom you have said, that those who are only two or three days old ought not to be baptized; and that the law of ancient circumcision ought to be considered; in agreement with a child, in your opinion, ought not to be baptized and sanctified before he had attained the eighth day: a far different judgment was given by all in our council. No one consented to what you thought fitting to be done; but on the contrary, we all judged that the mercy and grace of God ought not to be denied to any person born of man. For, as to the observation of the eighth day in the circumcision of the flesh, according to the Jewish law, that ordinance is a sacrament, appointed beforehand in shadow and in image, but complete in truth at the coming of Christ. The eighth day, that is, the first day after the Sabbath, was about to be that on which the Lord would rise again, and would confer upon us true life, and would give unto us the spiritual circumcision. Therefore, this eighth day, the first and the Lord's day after the Sabbath, went before in an image, which image ceased when the truth afterwards supervened, and when spiritual circumcision was given unto us."

baptism. Therefore, there is nothing in the writings of Tertullian, of which any need to boast in favour of their practice; especially, when we take into consideration the character of the man, as given by Mosheim: "He was endowed with a great genius, but seemed deficient in point of judgment; his learning was extensive and profound; and yet his credulity and superstition were such as might have been expected from the darkest ignorance; and with respect to his reasonings, they had more of that subtelty that dazzles the imagination, than of solidity that brings light and conviction to the mind." If such be the character of the individual with whose writings Dr. GILL was "so well acquainted," that they should be admired above all the writings of the Fathers, simply, because he recommended the delay of the baptism of infants, he was satisfied with a very little, even a "reed shaken with the wind." This will account for the manner in which Origen is dealt with, when he says, "one is at a loss to find Origen in Origen;" probably, because Origen speaks too plainly, when he says, "The church had from the apostles an order to give baptism to infants; for they to whom the divine mysteries were committed knew that there was in all persons the natural pollution of sin, which must be done away by water and the Spirit." If Dr. GILL "read all the Fathers," he must have known from the writings of Origen, who lived about the same time as Tertullian, that infant baptism was practised in the church from the apostles. "It is no wonder that men should lay hold of anything which seems to contain a possibility," that the writings of one of the Fathers are opposed to infant baptism. As "the truth shall be established in the mouth of two or three witnesses," so would we establish our practise of infant baptism, so far as history is concerned, by the writings of not only one of the Fathers, but many. Whatever

else they taught is not the point in question. Did they, or did they not, baptize infants? is what we have to do with. And when we are told by writers in the beginning of the second century that infants ought to be baptized, and a council of sixty-six bishops confirming the same, before the close of that century, how can we receive the objections of Tertullian, to the disparagement of all those who wrote before his time, who taught and practised infant baptism? Irenæus, who wrote about forty years after the apostles, and was born, it is said, before the death of John, and was acquainted with Polycarp, who was the disciple of John, says, concerning Christ, "He came to save all persons by himself who by him are regenerated unto God,—infants, little ones, youths, and elderly persons." Here candour must admit, that Irenæus alluded to the baptism of infants, not to teach the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration, but to confirm the practice of infant baptism, for he again says, "as the dry wheat, cannot become dough and a loaf without moisture, so neither can we all become one in Christ without the water which is from heaven. And as the parched earth cannot yield fruit unless it receives moisture, so neither can we, who at first are but sapless wood, ever produce living fruit without the rain which is freely poured out from above for our bodies through baptism, but our souls through the Spirit, have obtained that communion with the imperishable essence."* Thus we learn from Irenæus that baptism was practised only as a means unto the end, in symbolizing the descent of the Holy Spirit, that thereby they who are partakers thereof may bring forth "living fruit" to the praise and glory of God. Therefore so far as the means are concerned, intended as they are for the unbeliever, we must use them, "for the unbelieving

* Lib. iii. c. 17.

husband is sanctified by the wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the husband." Hence, there is a sanctification for the unbeliever, however opposed it may be to those who hold no such doctrine, whose selfishness is such as to deny the use of means to all who do not see "the truth," and are not "the called," even as they are called. There was no such spirit manifested by the apostle Paul, when he said, "For what knowest thou, O wife, whether thou shalt save thy husband? or how knowest thou, O man, whether thou shalt save thy wife." 1 Cor. vii. 14, 16. Thus one may become the instrument of the conversion of the other, by using the means which God has been pleased to sanctify for that purpose; for "The Lord is not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance." "Have I any pleasure at all that the wicked should die? saith the Lord God: and not that he should turn from his ways, and live?" Again he says, "Repent, and turn yourselves from all your transgressions; so iniquity shall not be your ruin. Cast away from you all your transgressions, whereby ye have transgressed; and make you a new heart and a new spirit: for why will you die, O house of Israel? For I have no pleasure in the death of him that dieth, saith the Lord God: wherefore turn yourselves and live.."—Ezekiel xviii. 23, 30—32. These words were addressed to a people, chosen by God as a peculiar people, to whom he gave the law with its various sprinklings and sanctifications to the purifying of the flesh," [Heb. ix. 13.] and designed to teach the sprinkling of the blood of Christ, to the sanctification of the heart through faith, that the laws of God may be in the mind, and written in the hearts of his people. [Heb. viii. 10.] Hence it must follow, that when the heart is renewed by grace, the thoughts rise above the baptism of water, because the

end is accomplished which it was designed to teach. Therefore, if we adopt the theory that it is unnecessary that all should repent and be converted before they are baptized, baptism is no longer a fundamental principle of repentance, but the principle of perfection, by which the believer is sealed and admitted into the church, contrary to the teaching of the apostle Paul. [Rom. vi. 2.] Hence we must be careful that we introduce into the church no doctrines of men, in lieu of those we are taught by Christ and his apostles, but "hold fast the beginning of our confidence" in that baptism which was designed to teach us to "repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand," that we may not only be sanctified "with the washing of water," but "by the word." [Eph. v. 26.] Then we shall "give the more earnest heed to the things which we have heard, lest at any time we should let them slip;" [Heb. ii. 1.] and, as we are enabled by the grace of God, to compare the scriptures so as to distinguish the law and grace, then we shall understand the force of these words, "He that despised Moses' law died without mercy under two witnesses: Of how much sorer punishment, suppose ye, shall he be thought worthy, who hath trodden under foot the Son of God, and hath done despite unto the Spirit of grace? For we know him that hath said, Vengeance belongeth unto me, I will recompense, saith the Lord."—Heb. x. 28—30. Keeping these things in mind, we will not handle "the word of God deceitfully," but seek to establish the next proposition.

THIRD.—*Baptism by Affusion, the only Scriptural Baptism acknowledged by Christ, and acknowledged by the Apostles.*

"ONE Lord, one faith, one baptism;" [Eph. iv. 5.] such were the the doctrines taught in the apostolic age. But, in the present age, we find the Socinian denying Christ as the second person in the Trinity, the infidel denying the faith by neglecting divine revelation, and others maintaining their practice of *dipping*, as the "one baptism" here mentioned. But the larger proportion of professing Christians adopt affusion as the only mode of Christian baptism, yet all profess to be guided by the scriptures, which has a tendency to embarrass the mind of the youthful enquirer, and create a spirit of controversy. Therefore it becomes us to set before the mind of our youth, the nature and design of that baptism they received in their infancy, that they may understand and feel the importance of these words—"sanctify the Lord God in your hearts: and be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh you a reason of the hope that is in you with meekness and fear."—1 Peter, iii. 15. In accordance with this passage, the Author would seek to establish the principles of Pædo-Baptism, as most consistent with the command of Christ and practice of the apostles. And, in proceeding, we have to notice the difference existing between Baptists and Pædo-Baptists, respecting the translation of the scriptures—the Baptists having established their own "Bible Translation Society," because the British and Foreign Bible Society will not engage to publish the Baptist translation, notwithstanding the circular sent by the Baptists to the British and Foreign Bible Society, which some say is "a masterly piece of argument" in favour of their translation. But, strange to say, they

prefer using the authorized version to their own, both in the pulpit and school! which is an argument against them, if *dip* and *dipping* be the right translation of the the terms baptize and baptism, we have a right to expect those who have such a translation to use it in their own places of worship. But, on the contrary, we find that it is printed for the Hindoo, not for the Britain. Hence a large number of Baptists are ignorant that such a society is in existence for the translation of the scriptures, so that many subscribe for what they know not.*

If the British and Foreign Bible Society had engaged to send forth an edition to suit the Baptists, we should have in Col. ii. 12, "Buried with him in *dipping*." Then the Socinian would ask for a translation of the same chapter, with the omission of the ninth verse, "For in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily;" and, probably, the Romanist would seek to push in his translation, "And John came preaching the baptism of penance." Thus we should have omissions from the Socinian, and additions from the Baptist and Romanist, which are contradictory to other portions of the sacred scriptures. From the Douay version of the scriptures, I cite the following passages:—"It behoved Christ to suffer, and to rise again from the dead the third day, and that penance and remission of sins should be preached unto all nations."—Luke xxiv. 46, 47. "I have kept back nothing that was profitable to you, but have preached to you, and taught you publicly, and from house to house, testifying both to Jews and Gentiles, penance towards God, and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ."—Acts xx. 20, 21. "Him hath God exalted

*A short time ago I was informed, that a Baptist church had collected a sum of money for the Bible Society, which was about to be remitted, when the mistake was discovered, and the money sent to the Baptist Bible Translation Society.

with his right hand to be Prince and Saviour, to give repentance to Israel, and remission of sins."—Acts v. 31. Here the Douay version, represents Christ as giving repentance from heaven, which has to do with the soul, and his servants "testifying both to Jews and Gentiles," not repentance, but "penance towards God." Thus are the scriptures perverted to suit the purposes of men.

On comparing the Baptist translation of the scriptures, the same error is to be noticed when John is made to say, "I indeed have *dipped* you with water: but he shall *dip* you with the Holy Ghost."—Mark i. 8. Now, as it is impossible to *dip* with, or in the Holy Ghost, we must once more search the scriptures, that we may know the truth concerning the baptism of the Holy Ghost. And there we find as plainly as words can tell us, from Peter, that the baptism of the Holy Ghost was by effusion:—"And as I began to speak, the Holy Ghost fell on them, as on us at the beginning. Then remembered I the word of the Lord, how that he said, John indeed baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost."—Acts xi. 15, 16. This was spoken to the apostles and brethren at Jerusalem, whose thoughts no doubt were carried back to the time when their Lord said unto them, "Ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence;" and they would also remember, that there "appeared unto them cloven tongues like as of fire, and it sat upon each of them. And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost."—Acts ii. 3, 4. Hence the baptism of the Holy Ghost is by effusion. If Peter had not spoken correctly there would have been some objection to his statement, but all having experienced the same baptism of the Holy Ghost, there was no question as to the mode of application; neither could there be any doubt in the minds of the apostles concerning the right mode of administering the baptism

of water, for they could not understand the baptism of the Holy Ghost to be by effusion, and the baptism of water by *dipping*. Hence the Baptists are driven to the necessity of making out their immersion, or *dipping*, in the best way they can from the baptism of the Holy Ghost. But in this the weakness of their arguments are manifest, when they bring only one passage of scripture to prove (as they think) that the baptism of the Holy Ghost is by immersion, and for this purpose they quote the following:—"And when the day of Pentecost was fully come, they were all with one accord in one place. And suddenly there came a sound from heaven as of a rushing mighty wind, and it filled the house where they were sitting. And there appeared unto them cloven tongues like as of fire and it sat upon each of them. And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost."—Acts ii. 1—4. Mr. PRICE says, page 14, "Now, as the house was filled, to me it certainly appears very much like immersion, not only so, but their being filled with the Holy Ghost looks very much like internal application." "Appears very much like," and "looks very much like,' are indefinite terms, and ought not to be used by those who are so confident that *bapto* means to *dip*, and nothing else, though they will admit "it has been said that it signifies to wash."* So that if the question has yet to be settled by Mr. PRICE, whether the baptism of the Holy Ghost is by effusion, or *dipping*, or by an internal or external application, he should by all means consult the Acts of the Apostles, and then he will come to the conclusion that the baptism of the Holy Ghost is not to be compared with immersion. If baptism is by the internal and external application of the baptismal element, I feel persuaded Mr. PRICE would not like to try the experiment a second time; yet his idea is quite

*Mr. ALOORN, page 24.

consistent with Dr. Carson's view of the matter, if carried out—"The baptized person dies under the water." However, Mr. PRICE has not only failed to prove immersion, from the baptism of the Holy Ghost, but failed to prove that immersion and *dipping* have the same meaning, for it is said, "that the sound came from heaven"—and of course the cloven tongues of fire came from the same place—"and they were filled with the Holy Ghost," so that, if Mr. PRICE will contend for the immersion of the apostles by the Holy Ghost, he must at least give up the argument that they were *dipped* into the Holy Ghost, especially when Peter shortly afterwards stood up in Jerusalem and said, "this is that which was spoken by the prophet Joel; And it shall come to pass in the last days, saith God, I will pour out of my Spirit upon all flesh: and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, and your young men shall see visions, and your old men shall dream dreams: And on my servants and on my handmaidens I will pour out in those days of my Spirit; and they shall prophesy."—Acts ii. 16—18. Thus we have another proof from the apostle Peter that baptism was by pouring, which was spoken of 800 years before it was fulfilled; therefore, if baptism means to *dip*, there can be no baptism or *dipping* of the Holy Ghost. Hence the baptism of the Holy Ghost is reduced to a mere phantom of the imagination, or a passing shadow having no reality, or sanctifying power. But did the apostles, on the day of Pentecost, receive the baptism of the Holy Ghost, so that they began to speak with other tongues as the Spirit gave them utterance? Yea, and thousands since have experienced the reality and truth of that baptism in their souls; and, having this baptism, they have been enabled to draw near to their God, "with a true heart in full assurance of faith," "knowing whom they have believed," they

rely upon his promises: "prove me now herewith, saith the Lord of hosts, if I will not open the windows of heaven, and pour you out a blessing, that there shall not be room enough to receive it"—Mal. iii. 10. Thus feeling their dependence upon the baptism, or pouring out of the Spirit, they come boldly to the throne of grace, saying,—

"Come, holy Spirit, heavenly dove,
With all thy quickening powers;
Kindle a flame of sacred love
In these cold hearts of ours."

But we proceed to notice the many definitions given to the term baptize, which Mr. THORNE has collected from several Baptist writers. "They assure us," says Mr. THORNE,* "that the Greek verb *Baptize*, means always and only to *dip*, or that, according to the usual arrangement of the definitions of it in most lexicons, this is its literal and primary meaning—proving, beyond all doubt, that the apostles really *dipped* their converts under water in baptism. This assumption is deemed the stronghold of our opponents, who, consequently labour to defend it with their utmost skill and perseverance. But that it is utterly untenable will be apparent by the subsequent remarks. To show the fallacy of the former assertion, I shall give you, in the first place, an alphabetical list of the translations or adopted renderings of this word, by four or five of their own leading writers; who, you may naturally suppose, have not selected passages nor given versions more to the damage of their own cause, than they were absolutely compelled by controversial necessity:—

* Dipping not Baptizing, page 7.

Bathe	Imbue	Quenched
Besmear	Immersed	Redden
Caused	Infected	Run through
Coloured	Involved	Smeared
Covered	Laid under	Soaked
Crushed	Let down	Sprinkled
Daubed	Oppressed	Stained
Dip	Overhead and ears	Sink
Drawing water	Overwhelmed	Steep
Drank much	Plunged	Swallowed up
Drowned	Pour	Thrust
Dyed	Purify	Tinged
Fill	Put	Washed
Given up to	Put into	Wetted:

in all 42.

Observe, secondly, that in seven Greek lexicons and Montanus' version of the scriptures, no less than 23 Latin words are employed to express the import of the the term Baptize in its various connexions.

Abluo, wash away	*Immergo*, plunge	*Obruo*, overwhelm
Colo, colour	*Impleo*, fill	*Pereo*, perish
Demergo, dive	*Intingo*, dye	*Purgo*, purge
Duco, lead	*Lavo*, wash	*Rubesco*, redden
Figo, pierce	*Madefacio*, wet	*Submergo*, put under
Fuco, paint	*Maculo*, pollute	*Terreo*, affright
Haurio, draw up	*Mergo*, dip	*Tingo*, stain
Imbuo, imbue	*Mundo*, cleanse	

Again, the Baptists say, 'that *Tingo* and *Baptizo* signify the same thing'—and in four Latin Dictionaries *Tingo* is explained by no less than 14 different English verbs:—

Bathe	Dye	Moisten	Stain	Wash
Colour	Imbue	Paint	Tincture	Wet
Dip	Immerse	Sprinkle	Tinge	

They also tell us, that 'The Hebrew *Tabal* is of the same signification as *Baptizo*'—and in five Hebrew

lexicons this word is defined by no less than ten distinct terms:

Baptize	Dive	Immerse	Merge	Plunge
Dip	Dye	Infect	Intinge	Tinge

And these definitions of the Greek, Latin, and Hebrew verbs, are not only various, but the majority of them is greatly in favour of applying the element to the object. Now, it is clear if this word have so many applications, and represents actions so opposite to that of putting a person under water, and instantly raising him out of it, or if it be synonymus with *Tabal* and *Tingo*, with what propriety can our opponents assert that it means always and *only* to *dip* or immerse?"

Mr. Alcorn is very stubborn on this point; in page 24, he says, "Dr. Carson observes, that '*bapto* signifies primarily to *dip*,' and as a secondary meaning, obviously derived from the primary, it denotes to *dye*. Every occurrence of the word may be reduced to one or other of these acceptations. * * * That *bapto* is used in the New Testament in the sense of *dipping*, and in this sense only, I shall now proceed to show. 1. In Matthew xxvi. 23, it is written,—'And Jesus answered and said, he that *dippeth* his hand with me in the dish, the same shall betray me.' Now, suppose we substituted the word sprinkleth for the word *dippeth*, and then see whether the sense will be alike good. 'He that sprinkleth his hand with me in the dish, the same shall betray me.' How could a man sprinkle his hand in a dish? We know well that he could *dip* it in; but to sprinkle it in would be impossible. Our excellent translators knew this; and therefore they were compelled to give the word in this passage its correct and legitimate rendering. 2. In Luke xvi. 24, we read,—'And he cried and said, Father Abraham, have mercy on me, and send

Lazarus, that he may *dip* the tip of his finger in water, and cool my tongue; for I am tormented in this flame.' Now, were we to read, 'That he may sprinkle the tip of his finger in water,' would it be alike intelligible? It would be impossible to sprinkle the tip of his finger in water; but it would be quite easy to *dip* it in. *Bapto*, then, must mean to *dip*." Such is the conclusion come to by Mr. ALCORN, which he thinks shows the absurdity of sprinkling, but which, in reality, proves that *dipping* is not baptizing, for there is not the remotest idea given in the text, that our Lord meant to say, "he that baptizeth or immerseth his hand with me in the dish, the same shall betray me." Neither are we to understand, that the whole hand was *dipped* in the dish, in the sense Baptists understand their *dipping*. Hence immersion, as understood by Baptists, is a straining of the term *dipping*, (merely to suit their practice) for when taken in its proper sense, it means, as Mr. ALCORN gives it from Dr. Carson, to "*dye*." Therefore, a piece of cloth undergoing the process of dying, must be well soaked in order to be well dyed; which will correspond with the list given from Baptist writers, in which they say, the Greek verb *Baptizo* "means always to *dip*;" from which the terms immersed and soaked are derived. So that the Baptists will not feel angry with us, if we say, that they would not like to carry out their faith to the full extent in their practice, and be well soaked before they are baptized. Thus, we can do no other than agree with Mr. ALCORN, that "our excellent translators have given the word *dip* its correct and legitimate rendering," because it does not mean "always" to baptize. And this we have from another portion of the word of God; when Naaman the Syrian was healed of his leprosy, according to the saying of the man of God—"Then went he down and *dipped* himself seven times in

Jordan."—2 Kings, v. 14. This *dipping* was not baptizing—being very different to the practice of Baptists in one man *dipping* another, yet the same term is used for the *dipping* of Naaman, as Baptists use for their baptism. Therefore, prefering the scriptural sense of the term, we come to the conclusion that the practice of *dipping* is the invention of men.

But once more: Mr. ALCORN goes on to say, "In John xiii. 26, we read, 'Jesus answered, he it is, to whom I shall give a sop (or morsel); he gave it to Judas Iscariot, the son of Simon.' Now, let us try whether we can substitute for *dipped*, the word poured, and still preserve the sense. 'He it is to whom I shall give a sop (or morsel) when I have poured it. And when he had poured the sop (or morsel), he gave it to Judas Iscariot.' You at once perceive that a sop (or morsel) could not be poured, but that it could be easily *dipped* into some sauce. In Revelations xix. 13, it is written, 'And he was clothed with a vesture *dipped* in blood.' That a vesture might be *dipped* in blood, is obvious; but that it could be poured or sprinkled in blood, is by no means credible. *In every instance in which bapto occurs in the New Testament, our Translators have rendered it by the word Dip.*" Such are the arguments Mr. ALCORN advances to prove his practice of *dipping*. But what the *dipping* of a sop, and a vesture *dipped* in blood, has to do with Christian baptism, I am at a loss to know—for there is not the slightest reference to baptism in the passages quoted—*dipping* having nothing to do with baptism, which is by sprinkling or pouring. Therefore, Mr. ALCORN has done more to damage the cause of *dipping*, than it were possible for us to do by all the arguments we could advance against the system. However, there is one passage in Eph. v. 25, 26, which none will deny has reference to Christian baptism: "Christ

also loved the Church, and gave himself for it; That he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word." In Lev. viii. 10—12, it is written: "And Moses took the anointing oil, and anointed the tabernacle and all that there was therein, and sanctified them. And he sprinkled thereof upon the altar seven times, and anointed the altar and all his vessels; both the laver and his foot, to sanctify them. And he poured of the anointing oil upon Aaron's head, and anointed him, to sanctify him." Thus we have pouring and sprinkling commanded by God, as the outward sign of sanctification. Therefore, if there is no sprinkling, or pouring in the Christian church, Christ did not sanctify and cleanse it, in the sense in which it is to be understood in the scriptures.

If *bapto* signifies primarily to *dip*, and has a secondary meaning obviously derived from the primary, it denotes to *dye;*" and "every occurrence of the word may be reduced to one or the other of these acceptations." Mr. ALCORN would not object to our trying the passages he has quoted, to prove the foolishness of sprinkling and pouring, according to the principle laid down by himself in the definition of the term *bapto;* and, as *dip* and immerse is generally admitted by Baptists to have the same meaning, none will object to our using immerseth instead of *dippeth*, in the following passage:—"And Jesus answered and said, he that immerseth his hand with me in the dish, the same shall betray me." Now, as the term immersion is given by some lexicographers to mean "to sink deep, to keep depressed, and to saturate," which agrees with the term soaked, we must conclude that Judas immersed his hand in the dish, or he *dipped* it without immersing it. Hence, *dipping* and immersion have not the same meaning, for the hand can be *dipped* without being immersed; therefore, it is

contrary to all sense to suppose, that the hand must be immersed before partaking of a sop. Again, if "*bapto* has a secondary meaning to *dye*," and is to be found in the passages referred to by Mr. ALCORN, then we have in Luke xvi. 24—"And he cried and said, Father Abraham, have mercy on me, and send Lazarus, that he may *dye* the tip of his finger in water, and cool my tongue; for I am tormented in this flame." Such a translation of the passage is not only unintelligible, but sheer nonsense. For I must confess, that I never heard until now, that Christian baptism was to be compared to a dying process! It is true that "divers washings" were practised by the Jews, such as washing the head, the hands, and the feet, also bathing the "flesh in water," [Num. xix. 19.] but the most frequent of these washings was by pouring or sprinkling; and never in any case was it known that one man *dipped* another. Therefore, when Baptists prove to us, from the scriptures, that John and Christ *dipped* their disciples, then we will receive their testimony as the truth. But at present we content ourselves with sprinkling, as the scriptural mode of baptism, believing that nothing more is required by Christ, in the commission given to his disciples.

Mr. PRICE objects to the idea of washing by sprinkling, when he says, "Mr. L.'s idea of washing is quite a novel one. He asks, Did not the Psalmist understand sprinkling, when he said, 'Purge me with hyssop, and I shall be clean, wash me, and I shall be whiter than snow.'—Psalm li. 7. Whatever others may have done, I confess that I never till now heard tell of washing by sprinkling!" Wonderful discovery, for one professing to write on Christian baptism! Yet, it is as much as may be expected from those who cannot rise above the surface of "the water," as though all the washings mentioned in scripture consisted in bathing or *dipping*

the flesh in water. But, can we come to such a conclusion, when we have such evidence as the following from Christ? "And he turned to the woman, and said unto Simon, Seest thou this woman? I entered into thine house, thou gavest me no water for my feet: but she hath washed my feet with tears, and wiped them with the hairs of her head."—Luke vii. 44. Another novel idea of washing for Mr. PRICE. Again it is written, "He riseth from supper, and laid aside his garments; and took a towel, and girded himself. After that he poureth water into a bason, and began to wash his disciples' feet, and to wipe them with the towel wherewith he was girded. Then cometh he to Simon Peter; and Peter saith unto him, Lord, dost thou wash my feet? Jesus answered and said unto him, What I do thou knowest not now; but thou shalt know hereafter. Peter saith unto him, Lord, not my feet only, but also my hands and my head. Jesus saith unto him, He that is washed needeth not save to wash his feet, but is clean every whit." John xiii. 4—10. This also may be a novel idea to Mr. PRICE, but it is a THUS SAITH THE LORD, that his washing of the feet, hands and head, is not required in the ceremonial service of the church, and, therefore, on Christ's authority, we dispense with it.

Above all men it is expected that "the elect" should know how to "sanctify the Lord God in" their "hearts: and be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh" them "a reason of the hope that is in them."—1 Peter, iii. 15. Sometimes, however, we hear men boasting of their being of the elect, yet displaying much ignorance respecting that which can only distinguish them as such, namely, "the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost; Which he shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Saviour."—Titus iii. 5. Thus, if we are regenerated and washed by the Holy Ghost, it

is not by *dipping*, but pouring; as Titus says, "shed on us abundantly," which corresponds with another portion of scripture:—"For I will pour water upon him that is thirsty, and floods upon the dry ground; I will pour my Spirit upon thy seed, and my blessing upon thine offspring." And because such passages are introduced to prove the washing of regeneration, or baptism, they are ridiculed by Mr. PRICE, page 13, "as the blessings of grace set forth under the idea of sprinkling and pouring," as though there was no reality in the pouring out of the Holy Ghost, because it does not correspond with his practice of *dipping*. Therefore, quoting his own words, we say, "Hence we see the folly of all such carnal reasonings." Had Mr. PRICE been acquainted with the scriptures, I feel persuaded he would not have allowed the following sentence to appear in his publication:—"I confess that I never until now, heard tell of washing by sprinkling!" For henceforth he must loose all confidence as a Christian teacher, until he can appreciate the language of the Psalmist,—"Purge me with hyssop, and I shall be clean, wash me, and I shall be whiter than snow."—Psalm li. 7. Then, so soon as he shall experience the same washing by sprinkling, the "idea of washing" will not be "a novel one," but such as may be found on comparing the scriptures. For THUS SAITH THE LORD, "As for the living bird, he shall take it, and the cedar wood, and the scarlet, and the hyssop, and shall dip them and the living bird in the blood of the bird that was killed over the running water: And he shall sprinkle upon him that is to be cleansed from the leprosy seven times, and shall pronounce him clean, and shall let the living bird loose into the field."—Lev. xiv. 6, 7. Here we have a person pronounced clean, so soon as he had been sprinkled; therefore the cleansing, or washing by sprinkling, was no "novel

idea" to the Jews. Nay, the apostle reminds them of the fact. "For if the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh; How much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God?"—Heb. ix. 13, 14. Here the apostle uses the same term as the Psalmist, and expresses the same idea of sprinkling, or purging the conscience. Then need we wonder that the Psalmist should say, "Purge me with hyssop, and I shall be clean, wash me, and I shall be whiter than snow. Create in me a clean heart, O God; and renew a right spirit within me."—Psalm li. 7—10. The Jews being accustomed to the sprinkling, or washing of water, could not mistake the words spoken by God, through the prophet Ezekiel:—"Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean: from all your filthiness and from all your idols will I cleanse you." We may be told that "the blessings of grace are set forth under the idea of sprinkling," but it refers to the time when the Jews shall be brought to a knowledge of the truth as it is in Christ Jesus. Then being buried with him in baptism, they will experience the baptism of the Holy Ghost, as promised by God. "A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you: and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you an heart of flesh. And I will put my spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes, and ye shall keep my judgments and do them."—Ezek. xxxvi. 25—27. That this has yet to be accomplished is evident from the following passage: "Neither shall they defile themselves any more with their idols, nor with their detestable things, nor with any of their transgressions: but I will save them out of all

their dwelling-places, wherein they have sinned, and will cleanse them: so shall they be my people, and I will be their God. And David my servant shall be king over them; and they all shall have one shepherd: they shall also walk in my judgments, and observe my statutes, and do them."—Ezek, xxxvii. 23, 24. Here are shalls and wills, which the Particular Baptist would do well to notice, as coming from God; having to do with the shepherd of the flock, of whom it is written, "his visage was so marred more than any man, and his form more than the sons of men: So shall he sprinkle many nations."—Isaiah lii. 14, 15. Hence we learn, that this sprinkling is not for the Jew only, but for the Gentile, and, therefore, if Christ sprinkles his people at all, it is, as we have before observed, to sanctify his church with the washing of water by the word. Thus the church is "baptized into Christ," [Gal. iii. 27.] not *dipped* into Christ, but baptized into the faith of his visage, being "marred more than any man," and that "he poured out his soul unto death." Hence the apostle says, "For by one Spirit are we all baptized (not *dipped*) into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free; and have been all made to drink into one Spirit."—1 Cor. xii. 13.

Once more we have to notice the arguments of the Baptists, in favour of their practice of *dipping*, from the prepositions IN, INTO, and OUT OF. These prepositions, they say, "are sufficient to prove beyond all doubt, that the disciples of John were *dipped* under water;" of course forgetting that they might be *in* the water, and yet not *under* the water. Therefore, *in* the water, and *under* the water, have different meanings, as will be seen from the following quotation. "The prepositions in question are translations of four Greek words:—APO, rendered *out of*, in Matt. iii. 16; EN, rendered

in, Matt. iii. 6; Eis and Ek, rendered *into* and *out of*, Acts viii. 38, 39. Perhaps the reader will be surprised to learn that in Schleusner's celebrated lexicon of the Greek Testament, the first is said to have 20 different senses; the second 36; the third 26; and the last 24. Again, the translators of the English Testament have rendered the first by 24 different words; the second by 32; the third by 36; and the last by 32. Finally, the word Apo is translated by *from* 374 times; En, by *at*, *on*, or *with*, 313 times; Eis, by *to* or *unto*, 538 times; and Ek, by *from*, 186 times. And it may be added, that learned men deem such to be the current senses of these respective prepositions, especially of the first three of them.* One passage of scripture will be sufficient to prove, that the preposition IN, is not to be understood always in the sense Baptists would have us to understand it, in making out their *dipping*. "To him that overcometh will I grant to sit down in my throne, even as I also overcame, and am set down with my Father in his throne."—Rev. iii. 21. If we are to exercise our senses on this passage, we shall come to the conclusion that Christ sat *on* the throne, and not *in* the throne. Therefore, because it is said, "and they of Jerusalem were baptized of John in the river of Jordan," we are not to conclude that John *dipped* his disciples under the water, for if so, our Baptist friends must allow us to use the preposition, when it is said, "John did baptize in the wilderness," [Mark i. 4, 5.] which is not composed of water, but sand. Hence we must conclude, that John *dipped* his disciples in neither, especially when we read in the eighth verse, that he baptized them "*with* water," and not *in* water. But, their is one historian who says, concerning John the Baptist, "The exhortations of this

* Thorne's Dipping not Baptizing, page 9.

respectable messenger were not without effect; and those who, moved by his solemn admonitions, had formed the resolution of correcting their evil dispositions and amending their lives, were initiated into the kingdom of the Redeemer by the ceremony of immersion, or baptism. Christ himself before he began his ministry, desired to be solemnly baptized by John in the waters of Jordan, that he might not in any point, neglect to answer the demands of the Jewish law."* So says Mosheim, but his evidence is contrary to the law, for there was no such demand in the law as one man *dipping* another.† And John being of the priesthood, would understand the law, and would baptize according to the law, by sprinkling his disciples, This we shall endeavour to prove—of course, taking the same privilege as the Particular Baptists in proving their Particular Redemption—from the law.‡

Some will say, that John was the first Baptist; whereas baptism was known long before, according to the apostle Paul, when he said to the church at Corinth, "Moreover brethren I would not have you ignorant, how that all our fathers were under the cloud, and all passed through the sea; And were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea."—1 Cor. x. 1, 2. Then,

* Mosheim, Cen. i. chap. 3.

† In a Tract, issued by a sect of Baptists calling themselves "The Disciples of Jesus," written in the form of question and answer, there is the following :—"Who was the most distinguished person whom he (John the Baptist) baptized?—The Saviour of the world. For what purpose was he baptized?—Neither for confessing his sins, nor for receiving remission of them, but 'to fulfil all righteousness,' or to honour the righteous institutions of God. 'Thus' said he, 'it becomes us to fulfil all righteousness,' or observe every divine institution." Now, if immersion was a divine institution, those who hold it as such, as given to John, ought in all justice to tell us where there is such a "divine institution" in the law, for until they do this we must abide by our faith and practice—believing our Lord fulfilled the righteousness of the law, when baptized by John.

‡ Rushton on Particular Redemption.

because some were baptized "in the cloud and in the sea," are we to take the preposition as meaning, that they were actually *dipped* "in the cloud and in the sea?" Certainly not; for it is written, "The children of Israel walked upon dry land in the midst of the sea; and the waters were a wall unto them on their right hand, and on their left."—Exodus xiv. 29. Thus, they were in the midst of the sea, yet upon dry land. There was no *dipping* here. Then how were they baptized unto Moses? The Psalmist says, "the waters saw thee, O God, the waters saw thee; they were afraid: the depths also were troubled. The clouds poured out water, the skies sent out a sound."—Psalm lxxvii. 16, 17. Now, as it is not said that Moses baptized the people, but that they "were baptized unto Moses," they could be baptized in no other way than by the pouring out of water from the clouds; yet, though I take this view of the baptism of the children of Israel, I would not deny to our Baptist friends the right of making out their immersion from the same chapter; for it is written, "And the Lord overthrew the Egyptians in the midst of the sea. And the waters returned, and covered the chariots, and the horsemen, and all the hosts of Pharoah that came into the sea after them; there remained not so much as one of them."—Exodus xiv. 27, 28. Thus the Egyptians were immersed in the sea, but there is nothing said of their being baptized, which proves that immersion is not baptism. If this should not be conclusive evidence against immersion, for those who say that a person must be "overwhelmed" before he is duly baptized, then we refer them once more to the scriptures, for it is written, "And he led them on safely, so that they feared not: but the sea overwhelmed their enemies."—Psalm lxxviii. 53. Hence the Egyptians were immersed or overwhelmed, but not "baptized unto Moses." On the

contrary, the children of Israel were not immersed or overwhelmed in the sea, yet they were baptized; plainly showing, that immersion has nothing to do with baptism. And this is more clear from the command given to Moses on the mount: "And the Lord said unto Moses, Go unto the people and sanctify them to-day and to-morrow, and let them wash their clothes. And Moses went down from the mount unto the people, and sanctified the people; and they washed their clothes."—Exodus xix. 10, 14.* Now, it would be impossible for Moses to sanctify the people in two days, by *dipping*

* "The Disciples of Jesus," professing to advocate "the Restoration of Primitive Christianity," have, for some months past, been seeking to establish themselves in Manchester, and for this purpose have been very diligent in distributing Tracts, and delivering Discourses on subjects relating to what they call "a Christian Church on the Apostolic basis." Some of these Discourses I have attended, particularly one on "Christian Union," by Mr. J. B. ROTHERHAM, in which he said, "before there can be Christian Union there must be one baptism." I could readily understand what this "one baptism" was, from their Tract, entitled *Questions on Baptism*, from which I give the following:—"How do you view all Pædo-Baptists, with regard to this ordinance of baptism? Can you, according to the scriptures, consider them as unbaptized?—There is but one baptism; and all who have not been immersed into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, after professing the faith of the gospel, have never been baptized, and are now in an unbaptized state." This being their view of "all Pædo-Baptists," I undertook, at their Conference on the subject, to prove—1. That there was no such baptism as immersion taught in the scriptures. 2. That John never baptized his disciples by immersion, but by sprinkling according to the law. Also, that John was not the first Baptist, as baptism was known to the Jews 1,500 years before he had an existence. 3. That Christ never sanctified his church by *dipping* or immersion. Time would not admit of any lengthened remarks, as only ten minutes was allowed to each speaker; whilst Messrs. KING and ROTHERHAM, who had previously given the Discourses, occupied one hour and a half in opening and closing the Conference; therefore, giving no chance of a reply to any arguments advanced by them. However, Mr. ROTHERHAM, when replying to the various speakers, very graciously passed by my arguments, by saying, "Our friend has taken great pains in bringing his artillery to bear against immersion." In responding to the compliment, I could but recommend Mr. R. to peruse these arguments, as they appear in a more lengthened form in this book. Mr. KING, in his reply, only took up one argument in reference to the passage of the children of Israel through the sea, by saying, "The Israelites had the sea on each side of them, and the cloud over them, so that they were immersed unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea." Thus Mr. KING admitted the fact that baptism was known to the Jews 1,500 years before John had an existence, contrary to their *Questions on Baptism*, which asks, "Who was the first Baptist?—John the harbinger of Christ." And again, Mr. KING is at issue with this Tract,

them under water, therefore he sanctified them by sprinkling water of purifying upon them, in the same way Aaron and his sons were sanctified. [Lev. viii. 10—12.] Then let none ridicule the idea, as a "novel one," but let them enquire what saith the Lord, and then they will learn that the Lord commanded Moses to "Take the Levites from among the children of Israel, and cleanse them. And thus thou shalt do to cleanse them: Sprinkle water of purifying upon them, and let them shave all their flesh, and let them wash their clothes, and so make themselves clean."—Num. viii. 6, 7. Therefore, having so clear a description of the Jewish mode of baptism, or purification, can we for a moment suppose that a priest would act in any way contrary to the law, by *dipping* his disciples in the river

for it says, baptism is being "immersed in water and completely overwhelmed in it." Now the Israelites did not touch the sea or the cloud, therefore they were neither immersed nor overwhelmed; for "the pillar of the cloud went from before their face, and stood behind them." So that it would pass over them, and thus pour down water, according to the Psalmist, to baptize them. [Psalm lxxvii. 16, 17.] But, on the contrary, that cloud was "darkness" (or mist) to the Egyptians, so that they were "overwhelmed" in the cloud, and "immersed" in the sea, and so received the baptism taught by Mr. KING. [*see* Exodus xiv. 19—22, Psalm lxxviii. 53.]

On another occasion I attended two Discourses, one by Mr. ROTHERHAM, on "the Institution of Circumcision," and the other by Mr. KING, on "the Institution of Christian Baptism." In the first of these, we had very little of the "Institution of Circumcision," and nothing at all about the circumcision of the heart, which the covenant was designed to teach. Therefore, I could not help remarking, that if Mr. ROTHERHAM knew anything at all about Primitive Christianity, he ought to teach it as Paul taught it, when he said, "For we are the circumcision which worship God in the spirit, and rejoice in Christ Jesus, and have no confidence in the flesh."—Phil. iii. 3, Rom. ii. 28, 29. Mr. KING'S Discourse consisted altogether of raillery against all who practised Infant Baptism, which he denounced as the "master curse." However, I am glad to find that they have been so well met by the working men of Manchester, which Mr. KING appeared to feel, when he said, "You have not dealt handsomely with us; all have spoken against us, and none for us." This goes to prove, that the people of Manchester know more of Primitive Christianity, than those who come from London and Nottingham to teach it to them. We are informed in their *British Evangelist*, that, from the 1st of July to the 16th of September, "*six* individuals have been immersed into Jesus' death;" and they have formed a church of "*twelve* in all." Surely, it will not be said of them, they have "turned the world upside down."

Jordan? John came not to introduce a new baptism, or to introduce a new law, but to preach repentance. Neither was there anything startling to the Jews, when he told them of one who should baptize them "with fire," knowing that it was written in the law, "Everything that may abide the fire, ye shall make it go through the fire, and it shall be clean; nevertheless, it shall be purified with the water of separation."—Num. xix. 13, xxxi. 23. Thus the articles purified according to the law, were typical of the work assigned to Christ by the prophets: "And he shall sit as a refiner or purifier of silver; and he shall purify the sons of Levi, and purge them as gold and silver, that they may offer unto the Lord an offering in righteousness."—Mal. iii. 3. "He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost, and with fire: whose fan is in his hand, and he will throughly purge his floor, and gather his wheat into the garner; but he will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire."—Matt. iii. 11, 12. God was pleased to fulfil these promises in the hearts of the first Gentile converts, by purifying them "with the Holy Ghost and with fire," before they had received the baptism of water, that "one jot or one tittle should in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled." Thus, when Peter saw "that on the Gentiles also was poured out the gift of the Holy Ghost," he knewthat it was not enough, but knowing the requirements of the law, ("nevertheless it shall be purified with the water of separation,") said, "Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we? And he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord." Therefore what the water of separation once was to the Jew, baptism now is to the Gentile, in separating him from heathenism and setting him apart in the name of the Lord. The Jews were commanded to sprinkle all things, whether

they had passed through the fire or not; so did our Lord and the apostles baptize those who had received the Holy Ghost, and those who had not, and consequently, Christian baptism may be called the anti-type of the water of separation in the Mosaic Economy. Again it is written, "Then cometh Jesus from Galilee to Jordan unto John, to be baptized of him. But John forbad him, saying, I have need to be baptized of thee, and comest thou to me? And Jesus answered and said unto him, suffer it to be so now, for thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness: then he suffered him." Then this righteousness must be in accordance with the law, and was understood as such by John. Therefore, as there is no *dipping* in the law, our Lord was not *dipped* by John; but was sanctified, or set apart according to the law, by pouring or sprinkling, just as he was about to enter upon his public ministry. [Lev. viii. 9—12. "And lo, the heavens were opened unto him, and he saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove, and lighting upon him: And lo, a voice from heaven, saying, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased."—Matt. iii. 16, 17. So that he was not only baptized by John, but by the Spirit; to which Mr. PRICE objects, when he says, "To this it is sufficient to observe, that throughout the whole of the New Testament, Christ is nowhere said to be baptized of the Spirit. So that it will be soon enough to speak about "the manner of application" when we have scriptural proof that Christ was thus baptized." Here Mr. P. insinuates the superiority of the baptism of water, in order to fulfil all righteousness;" and that it was not necessary for our Lord to receive the baptism of the Spirit. But what saith the scriptures? "The Spirit of the Lord God is upon me, because the Lord hath anointed me to preach good tidings to the meek; he hath sent me to bind up

the broken hearted; to proclaim liberty to the captives, and open the prison to them that are bound."—Isaiah lxi. 1. "That word I say ye know, which was published throughout Judæa, and began from Galilee, after the baptism John preached. How that God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost and with power."—Acts x. 37, 38. If Mr. P. will only examine the scriptures, he will find that this anointing is by pouring. [Lev. viii. 11. 12.] Therefore, if the Spirit is pleased to descend in the likeness of a dove on Christ, and as tongues of fire upon the apostles, and to fall on others, I cannot understand what difference it can make to Mr. PRICE, unless he be like some of John's disciples who said, "We have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost."—Acts xix. 2.

But I proceed to notice a few circumstances connected with John's baptism, proving, beyond all doubt, that John did not *dip* his disciples. And in the first place it is said, "There went out unto him all the land of Judæa, and they of Jerusalem, and were all baptized of him in the river of Jordan, confessing their sins."—Mark i. 5. Of the population of Judæa we cannot form a correct idea; however, Josephus says, "So these high-priests, on the coming of their feast which is called the Passover, when they slay their sacrifices from the ninth hour to the eleventh, but so that a company of not less than ten belong to a sacrifice (for it is not lawful for them to feast singly by themselves), and many of us are twenty in a company, found the number of sacrifices was two hundred and fifty six thousand, five hundred; which upon the allowance of no more than ten that feast together, amounts to two million, seven hundred thousand, and two hundred persons that were pure."* Thus we

* Josephus War, 6, Chap. 9.

may have some idea of the population of Palestine, though what we have from Josephus, only includes the number who came up to the feast of the Passover, A. D. 70. Therefore, the greater number would not be estimated; so that we are not to suppose, because it is said, "There went out to him all the land of Judæa," that John actually baptized the whole population, especially if we are to believe the Baptists, that he *dipped* them under the water. But, suppose we take the lowest estimate at two hundred and fifty thousand persons *dipped*—allowing two minutes for each, and ten hours each day, (including the Sabbath) for John to continue his *dipping*, and say nothing about time for preaching—more than two years would elapse before John could have completed the work given him to do by Baptists. But, say the Baptists, "could he not have assistance?" As there is nothing said on this matter in the scriptures, and Baptists object to our inferences, they must be satisfied with the narrative as it is given. Indeed, there was no necessity for any assistance; for, if Moses could sanctify all the people in the wilderness in two days, surely John could sanctify the whole population, by sprinkling upon them the water of purification, during the six months his ministry continued. Therefore, there can be no difficulty connected with the baptism of John, only as men make it, for it is evident that the baptism of John was according to the customary ablutions of the law, from the following passage:—"Then there arose a question between some of John's disciples and the Jews about purifying. And they came unto John, and said unto him, Rabbi, he that was with thee beyond Jordan, to whom thou barest witness, behold, the same baptizeth, and all men come to him."—John iii. 25, 26. Hence we learn, that this purifying was baptizing according to the law, and, therefore, it is from

heaven, which is confirmed by Christ when he asked the question, "The baptism of John, was it from heaven, or of men?" To which the chief priests and scribes answered, "We cannot tell." Thus did Christ appeal to the teachers and writers of the law, who professed to be ignorant of the origin of John's baptism, but knew well that it was from heaven according to the law, against which they had rebelled—because they believed not John when he came preaching the baptism of repentance.

Again, if John's baptism was by *dipping*, then of course all the necessary arrangements must have previously been made; such as the erection of booths, and the preparation of *dipping* robes for the thousands who came to be baptized of John in Jordan, for it cannot be expected that John *dipped* them in the clothing in which they came, and that some of them should return home to Jerusalem, some thirty miles distant, dripping as "they came up out of the water!" Neither can it be expected that John was provided with a Macintosh coat, or leggings, during the wet and weary work allotted to him by Baptists; but, on the contrary, we know that John "was clothed with camel's hair, and with a girdle of skin about his loins."—Mark i. 6. Thus John wore the loose robes usually worn by the Jews—requiring the girdle to gird them about their loins when on a journey, or engaged in manual labour. [Exodus xii. 11.] Hence it was necessary that John should have the "girdle of skin about his loins," to prevent his garment being wet when stooping to obtain water to baptize his disciples. Had John *dipped* his disciples in the midst of the stream, his clothing would have been saturated and heavy with water; and thus with the weight of his own clothing, and the weight of those he *dipped*, it is questionable whether he could have stood the labour for a single day—whereas, according to the

calculation of some writers, it would have taken seven years to *dip* all who came to be baptized of John in Jordan. Other circumstances connected with the river Jordan, prove that John did not *dip* his disciples. The spot where John baptized has been visited by many intelligent, and credible travellers, who tell us, that "Here the river Jordan is of considerable width—the water turbulent—the bottom rocky—the edges of the bank abrupt—and the depth about six or seven feet close to the shore." Volney says, "Its breadth between the two principal lakes, in few places exceeds sixty or eighty feet. but its depth is about ten or twelve." Monro says, "The river here, at the baptizing spot, forms an angle, &c.; the width of it might be about thirty-five yards, and the stream was running with the precipitous fury of a rapid—the bank was steep, shelving off abruptly into deep water." Thompson says, "It is exceedingly deep, even at the edge of the inner bank." Dr. Shaw computes it "about thirty yards broad, and three yards deep." Chateaubriand found the Jordan to be "six or seven feet deep close to the shore." Therefore, having these facts before us, we must come to the conclusion that John did not *dip* his disciples in the "river of Jordan."

Seeing then, that there was no probability of *dipping* in the Jordan, we pass on to Ænon, for it is said, "John also was baptizing in Ænon near to Salim, because there was much water there."—John iii. 23. A powerful argument for our Baptist friends, "certainly," but not more powerful than the "much water" in the Jordan for *dipping*, for it cannot be supposed that John removed from the Jordan to the well of Ænon, because there was much more water there for *dipping*, for it is described by a Baptist writer as "a cavernous spring called the Dove's Eye; and such were of great account in Judæa, especially in some seasons." Robinson says,

"It is remarkable that no such place, distinguished by an abundance of water, can be discerned at this day." Calmet also says, that "It is most likely that Ænon was to Salim what Jacob's well was to the inhabitants of Samaria—a place of drawing water. At all events it is clear that John could not have quitted the Jordan for Ænon, on account of the quantity of water it contained; for surely they had enough in the river, and more than in this insignificant well,—which, at best, must have been a most inconvenient place for immersing the people." If our Baptist friends would take such evidence as this, there would be less quibbling about the "much water," as though the water could not be used for another and better purpose than *dipping;* which is implied in the question asked by Mr. ALCORN, "If the Baptist only sprinkled his converts, what did he want with much water? A small quantity in a leathern bottle would have answered the purpose; it would have been loss of time to go such a distance merely for much water, and would also have appeared exceedingly ridiculous." But is it not more ridiculous for a public teacher to talk thus, when he ought to know that the Holy Land is not to be compared with his own favoured country, which abounds with springs and rivers. Ought not he to know, that a small quantity "of water was not to be obtained, only at such places as the river Jordan, and the well of Ænon, where there was much water?" However, there is this to be said of John's baptism, that there was not so much water required at Ænon, as there was in the Jordan; therefore, John did not require the "much water" for *dipping*, so much as he required it for the refreshment of those who came to his baptism. It is also very unlikely that the inhabitants of Ænon would allow a large quantity of water, to be used for the purpose of *dipping*, and, consequently, there can be no possibility of an argument

being drawn from the "much water" in favour of *dipping*, for it would have been dangerous for a large concourse of people to encamp where there was little or no water.

Mr. ALCORN appears to forget that the water would be required for drinking or cleansing purposes, as though John did not want the "much water" for anything else than *dipping*. Thus, the circumstances connected with John's baptism are never considered by our Baptist friends, which when considered, must do away with all possibility that John *dipped* his disciples. Therefore, it is in vain that Baptists attempt to prove their practice of *dipping* from the baptism of John—which they say is Christian baptism—simply, because Christ was baptized by John, and said, "for thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness;" though it is true, there was no difference between the baptisms of John and Christ, so far as the mode is concerned, for John's purifying and Christ's baptizing were understood as having the same meaning. [John iii. 25, 26.] So that the question about purifying, could not be respecting the mode of administration, but, because "all men" came to Christ for baptism—concerning which, John displayed no feeling of jealousy when he said, "He must increase, but I must decrease;" therefore, John's baptism was only for a time, which ended with his ministry, but the baptism of Christ was to continue, as John bare record—"He that receiveth his testimony hath set to his seal that God is true."—John iii. 33. Hence we have Christian baptism as a seal "that God is true," which is the seal of righteousness received in the forehead, by those who are named in the name "of the living God;" [Rev. vii. 2, 3.] corresponding with the seal of righteousness received in the foreskin of the flesh by Abraham. [Rom. iv. 11.] Though neither seal may be visible to the eye

of man, they are known to God, who gave the seal, and commanded that it should be affixed in the foreskin of the flesh of his people the Jews, and afterwards in the foreheads of his servants in the church of Christ. Then it is clear if we receive the practice of *dipping*, as the seal of God, we must reverse the order of things, by placing the seal on the back of the head, because in *dipping*, that part of the head comes in contact with the element first, and, therefore, it cannot be the seal of Christian baptism.

Again, had our Lord practised *dipping*, there is no telling when all who are said to have come to his baptism would be baptized; for it is said, "All men come unto him," and, "that he made more disciples than John." [John iv. 1, 2.] It is true, that Jesus had assistance, "for Jesus baptized not but his disciples;" yet, with this assistance, it was not possible for them to *dip* the multitudes, travelling as they did from city to city through all the land of Judæa, Samaria, and Galilee, where we have no evidence of there being "much water there," though we know that he was often where there was much more water than John had in the river Jordan, or at Ænon, for his baptism. But, the great difficulty Baptists have in proving that Christ *dipped* his disciples is, because it is not said that he baptized *in* the sea. However, should they maintain the preposition to be in their favour in this case, I do not envy them of it, for it is said, "that he entered into a ship and sat in the sea."—Mark iv. 1. Of course we are not to understand from this passage, that he sat in the water, (for that would be a contradiction to the preposition "into,") but, "that he entered into a ship," and the ship being on, or in the sea, he seated himself down in the ship. Again, if the prepositions IN and INTO are to be understood as referring to baptism by *dipping*, then the case

of the "impotent man" was of this description, for he said, "Sir, I have no man, when the water is troubled, to put me into the pool."—John v. 7. This, certainly, is the nearest scriptural argument Baptists have in making out their baptism by *dipping*. But "Jesus saith unto him, Rise, take up thy bed and walk;" so that here the preposition "into" was dispensed with, and the man was cured out of the water. Hence, the main principles of Christian doctrine are not contained in the "much water," so often brought before us by Baptists, but in the teaching connected with the water, such as the "baptism of repentance" preached by John.

Baptism could not be understood by Christ's disciples to be by *dipping* in water, when "Jesus said unto them, Ye shall indeed drink of the cup that I drink of; and with the baptism that I am baptized withal shall ye be baptized."—Mark x. 39. The disciples would unquestionably understand the baptism as the suffering to which they should afterwards be subject—not that they should be *dipped* into suffering, but that it should come upon them, because of their profession of Christ, which all the disciples of Christ, since that time, have more or less experienced. Our Lord, when speaking of this baptism, said, "I have a baptism to be baptized with, and how am I straitened until it be accomplished."—Luke xii. 50. He was then looking forward to the time of his agony and death, when he should partake of the cup poured out for him to drink. Thus the baptism, or sufferings of Christ, are set forth under the idea of a cup poured out. "O my Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me: nevertheless not as I will, but as thou wilt."—Matt. xxvi. 39. But there were none to share his sufferings, or to drink of the cup poured out: "He was taken from prison and from judgment: and who shall declare his generation? for he was cut off

out of the land of the living: for the transgression of my people was he stricken. And he made his grave with the wicked, and with the rich in his death; because he had done no violence, neither was any deceit in his mouth."—Isaiah liii. 8, 9. When this baptism was accomplished, with what propriety he could say, "I have trodden the wine press alone: and of the people there was none with me: for I will tread them in mine anger, and trample them in my fury; and their blood shall be sprinkled upon my garments, and I will stain all my raiment. For the day of vengeance is in mine heart, and the year of my redeemed is come."—Isaiah lxiii. 3, 4.

When our Lord commissioned his disciples to "Go, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost," [Matt. xxviii. 19.] they could not understand him to say, that they must go, *dipping* all nations, because all the necessary arrangements would have to be made for that purpose; whereas, they had previously been told to "provide neither two coats, nor shoes;" [Matt. x. 10.] therefore it is not to be expected that they would provide a *dipping* coat, or high-boots, for the use of the baptistry. Nor can it be expected that they were to go, *dipping* all the nations, in the coat they had on, without the least expectation of meeting with any who would have all things in readiness for the inconvenience of *dipping*. "And whosoever shall not receive you, nor hear your words, when ye depart from that house or city, shake off the dust of your feet."—Matt. x. 14. Thus were the apostles commissioned to go forth, preaching the gospel to all nations "beginning at Jerusalem," of which we have an account in the second chapter of the Acts of the Apostles. "Now when they heard this, they were pricked in their hearts, and said unto Peter and to the

rest of the apostles, Men and brethren, what shall we do? Then Peter said unto them, Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost. For the promise is unto you, and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call." Dr. GILL says, this "Plainly points at and describes the persons intended, whether Jews or Gentiles effectually called by grace, who are encouraged by the motive in the promise, to profess repentance and submit to baptism; which can only be understood of adult persons, and not infants."* Here Dr. GILL passes by the "promise is to you and to your children," as though children were excluded from the promise; however, be that as it may, it does not appear that the apostle preached the same doctrine as Dr. GILL, or his successors. For the call was preached and promised to "Parthians, and Medes, and Elamites, and the dwellers in Mesopotamia, and in Judæa, and Cappodocia, in Pontus, and in Asia, Phyrgia, and Pamphylia, in Egypt, and in the parts of Libya about Cyrene, and the strangers of Rome, Jews and proselytes, Cretes and Arabians."—Acts ii. 9—11. Yes, the call was intended for those who "denied the Holy One and the Just, and desired a murderer to be granted unto them. And killed the Prince of life." To such the apostle made the call: "Repent ye therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out, when the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord; and he shall send Jesus Christ, which before was preached unto you."—Acts iii. 14, 20. Such were the characters the apostles preached to, that they might repent and be converted; which is contrary to the

Body of Divinity, Vol. 3, page 326.

practice of some in our day, who say, that the Lord will call his own in his own good time, and therefore it is useless to preach to the sinner, "Repent and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out." Thus, being content with their own adoption (they say) as children, no effort is required to save a soul from death, and so hide a multitude of sins. [James v. 20.] Hence we conclude, that if men will mistake one part of the commission in teaching all nations, we may expect them to object to the other part of the commission, in refusing to baptize all nations. Therefore, their faith and practice is contrary to that of the apostles, when they baptized "about three thousand souls" immediately after they heard the first sermon, without any previous arrangement—so that, if all these were *dipped*, it is for the Baptist to inform us, how the apostles obtained the large quantity of water that would be required for the purpose. Dr. GILL says, "The many pools and private baths, and various apartments and things in the temple fit for such a use, all which they might be allowed the use of—they having favour with all the people." *Might be allowed* the use of, and *having* the use of, have different meanings; for, though the apostles were favoured by the people, it is not said that they were favoured by the rulers of the people, who had all command of the temple. Hence there is a difficulty in the way of immersion being practised in the temple; for it is not likely that the priests would allow the use of the temple and its utensils, for the purpose of *dipping* contrary to the law. Nor is it likely the priests would provide three thousand changes of dress for the people who were being proselyted from them, but rather than they should not be *dipped*, everything is conveniently arranged for them (according to the imagination of Baptists), and every difficulty, or improbability removed. Hence it is as

Mr. THORNE says, "To make immersion feasible, under certain awkward circumstances, they draw largely upon their inventive faculties. Without the least hint of authority from the word of God, they find great waters where, for aught they know, there was scarcely any—erect large baths in all eastern houses and prisons—provide suitable changes of dress for people to be *dipped* in—construct a lot of tents along the banks of the Jordan—borrow the brazen sea and lavers of the temple for Peter to baptize in—make John perform the work of fifty ordinary men—construe a case of drowning into an evidence of *dipping*—compare an instantaneous immersion to a final interment—designate baptism by pouring a figurative plunging—and so on almost to the end. They, then, gravely turn round and command us to keep close to the letter of scripture; at the same time declaring that in all positive institutions, reasonings, surmises, and fancy, must be banished from our investigations! In truth, however clear their cause may appear to partial and unenlightened partizans, their learned and best read advocates find ten-fold more difficulties in bending the circumstances of apostolical baptism to favour immersion, than we do in harmonizing them with affusion—indeed we find none at all—while they are incessantly at fault."

I now pass on to notice the number baptized by the apostles on the day of Pentecost. It is said, "Then they that gladly received his word were baptized: and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls."—Acts ii. 41. If the apostles *dipped* this large number, we may calculate upon their being up to the middle in water, at least eight hours! Certainly wet and weary work—such as no Baptist minister of the present day would undertake, though he have his waterproof gown and boots, with which there is

no evidence that the apostles were provided. But here again the Baptist finds no difficulty. Mr. ALCORN, especially, has a novel way of ridding himself of the difficulty, when he says, "It has been further objected against immersion, that on the day of Pentecost there would not have been time to immerse the three thousand who are said to have been baptized. In reply, we would remind the objector that there was at this time 'above five hundred brethren.' There were then 'above five hundred brethren' at the day of Pentecost. But let us say there were five hundred, and let us calculate how many each of these must baptize in order to get the three thousand baptized in the day. Six times five hundred would be just three thousand; so that each of those brethren would only have to baptize six individuals! Now can you see it possible for 'three thousand' to have been baptized in a day?" Yes, we think it possible for ten times three thousand to be baptized in a day; but we think it impossible for the apostles to have *dipped* three thousand in a day. Hence Mr. ALCORN has done more to damage the cause, and increase the difficulty of *dipping* so large a number, than he has done to relieve it; for he increases the number of baptistries from twelve to five hundred. And, moreover, he has forgotten to record particulars where these baptistries were; and how all the candidates were provided with *dipping* robes, who came not knowing that they were to be *dipped*. If the three thousand baptized by the apostles were *dipped*, it would appear that they were *dipped* in the clothing they had on: therefore, they would have to return to their various lodgings dripping from the baptistry! And three thousand in this state, going through the streets of Jerusalem, would certainly create some excitement; which would probably end in their being hooted, as drunken persons who had fallen into

the brook Kedron, or into some ditch in the neighbourhood. Had Mr. ALCORN examined the law, probably he would have suggested a much easier way—that each one bathed himself in water; [Num. xix. 19.] which would be far more sensible than one man *dipping* another, in a good suit of black clothing, as practised by some Baptists of the present day.

Again, Mr. ALCORN endeavours to make out his immersion from Mark vii. 4. "And when they come from the market, except they wash, they eat not. And many other things there be, which they have received to hold, as the washing of cups, and pots, brazen vessels, and of tables:" concerning which, Mr. A. says, "We verily believe the Jews did immerse these articles." Granting the Jews did immerse these articles, for the sake of cleanliness, which of course "is the common practice in our day," then does it follow that the Jews must do so in their religious ceremonies, when we know from the law that they sprinkled them? "And a clean person shall take hyssop, and dip it in the water, and sprinkle it upon the tent, and upon all the vessels, and upon the persons that were there."—Num. xix. 18. Our Lord, when addressing those who observed this law, said, "Ye blind guides, which strain at a gnat, and swallow a camel. Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye make clean the outside of the cup and of the platter, but within they are full of extortion and excess. Thou blind Pharisee, cleanse first that which is within the cup and platter, that the outside of them may be clean also."—Matt. xxiii. 24—26. Now, our Lord did not condemn the practice of cleansing these vessels by sprinkling, for in that he would have condemned the law he came to fulfil, but he did condemn the practice that the means justified the end; and therefore he said, "Thou blind Pharisee, cleanse first that

which is within the cup and platter, that the outside of them may be clean also." And, if he said this to those who did not require "much water" for their sprinkling, what will he say to those who have so much to say about the "much water," as necessary for their external washing or *dipping*? as though God had not ordained other means, corresponding with those, by which he washes and sanctifies the soul. Therefore it becomes those who are the advocates of "much water," in adhering to what they conceive to be fulfilling the letter of scripture in their practice of *dipping*, to be careful lest they fall into the same condemnation as the Pharisees, in making too much of the outward washing, instead of attending to the more weightier matters of the law. God is no respecter of persons, for what he said unto the Pharisees he says unto all who boast of fulfilling the righteousness of the law: "Ye blind guides, which strain at a gnat, and swallow a camel." Another argument brought forward by Mr. ALCORN, is taken from the Jewish *Mishna:* "A bed that is wholly defiled, a man *dips* it part by part." Here Mr. A. thinks he has a powerful argument in favour of his *dipping*, which is nothing more than is required according to sanitary regulations, and which Mr. A. would attend to himself—of course being particularly careful that the feathers were not *dipped*—thus Mr. A. fails to make out his *dipping* "part by part."

In the next place we notice the mode of baptism administered by the apostles and evangelists, as recorded in the Acts of the Apostles. Philip, at Samaria, "baptized both men and women." Not a word is said about *dipping* them, for this would appear ridiculous when compared with other passages of scripture; for it is written concerning Christ, "He left Judæa, and departed again into Galilee. And he must needs go through

Samaria. Then cometh he to a city of Samaria, which is called Sychar, near to the parcel of ground that Jacob gave to his son Joseph. Now Jacob's well was there." And it was there Jesus preached to the Samaritans the word of life. And "they besought him that he would tarry with them: and he abode with them two days. And many more believed because of his own word." Then no Baptist will hesitate to say that they were baptized, because it does not appear that there was "much water" as a convenience for *dipping*, for "The woman saith unto him, Sir, thou hast nothing to draw with, and the well is deep;" [John iv. 11.] therefore it is not likely the Samaritans were *dipped* in the well, nor is it likely that the large quantity required for the purpose could be spared, or carried from the well some distance into the city. So that the only conclusion we can come to is, that Jesus did not *dip* these believers in Samaria; and Philip, visiting the same people, baptized "both men and women," [Acts viii. 12.] after the example of his master. Next we find Philip on his way to the desert, between Jerusalem and Gaza, where he meets with "a man of Ethiopia, an eunuch under Candace queen of the Ethiopians." This person Baptists say, Philip *dipped*, because he said after Jesus had been preached unto him, "See, here is water; what doth hinder me to be baptized? And Philip said, If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest. And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God. And he commanded the chariot to stand still: And they went down both into the water, both Philip and the eunuch; and he baptized him." Why it should be distinctly stated in this case and not in those we have already noticed—that they both went down into the water—I confess I cannot tell, unless it was an unusual occurrence, which was evidently the case; for,

granting that the passage is to be understood in the strictest sense, which so far is in favour of the Baptists, it does not prove that the eunuch was *dipped*, for he could go "into the water" without being *dipped*, with much less inconvenience than any who practice *dipping* in the present day. If the Baptists will contend that going down into the water means *dipping* over head, then he must also submit to this, that Philip was *dipped* over head as well as the eunuch. Nothing of course is said concerning the clothing they had on for the occasion, so that we conclude there was no previous preparation for the *dipping:* nor can it be supposed that the Ethiopian nobleman changed his clothing on the public highway, in the presence of his attendants. The Baptists must also admit, though it is not exactly according to the letter of scripture, that this important personage would not travel without his usual attendants through lands infested with robbers, between Ethiopia and Jerusalem. Again, as we have seen that Philip and the eunuch "went down both into the water," without changing their dress, "and when they were come up out of the water," their does not appear to be any time allowed for changing their wet clothes; for "the Spirit of the Lord caught away Philip, that the eunuch saw him no more; and he went on his way rejoicing." Certainly not a very pleasant position to rejoice in, if *dipping* is to be maintained under the circumstances connected with the baptism of the eunuch; for the scriptures are thereby perverted, the eunuch is made "to go on his way" dripping, and Philip is found drenched at Azotus!

Note.—On examining the map of Palestine I find there is a brook called Sareck, between Jerusalem and Gaza, where Philip was directed to go to meet the eunuch. [Acts viii. 26.] "Jerome," who knew the spot well, "calls it a small brook," such as we often cross in a common road—a clear proof that in his time (about 370), it was not universally believed that the eunuch was *dipped*. The expression, see! here is water! indicates clearly, that it was arrived at without any previous expectation.

Again, we find Peter at Cæsarea preaching to the Gentiles, on whom "also was poured out the gift of the Holy Ghost." Therefore Peter said unto them, "Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we? And he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord."—Acts x. 47, 48. Had these persons received baptism by *dipping*, it would have been superfluous for Peter to say, "Can any man forbid water," which implies that water should be brought; also that there could be no objection to the administration of baptism, when the Holy Ghost had been given: so that if this baptism was by *dipping*, there was "much water" there in the sea, which no doubt would be preferred rather than the stagnant pool. However, as it does not appear that these persons were *dipped* in the sea, we must conclude that they received baptism by pouring, in the way Peter understood it; as we have already noticed in another place. [Acts xi. 15, 16.] Therefore, if Peter baptized by affusion so would Paul, after the mode of his own baptism, of which there was no delay; for it was said unto him, "arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord."—Acts xxii. 16. As a Jew, Paul would be familiar with the practice of the ceremonial washing away of sins, which was by sprinkling; and this is more apparent when we take the circumstances of the case into consideration. Here is the persecutor with letters from the high-priests on his way to Damascus. He is arrested by the hand of God when in sight of the city, where he expects to fulfil his mission of tyranny and oppression—his feet are swift to shed blood—and, as he had assisted at the stoning of Stephen, so he hastens to drain out the last drop of blood in the veins of those who had been baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus—he is struck

blind, and a devout man is directed to visit him in a strange house, where he finds Saul of Tarsus blind and fatigued, which certainly could be no enviable condition for the baptistry. But he was baptized without any previous arrangement, and that by a stranger; which is widely different to the practice of Baptists in the present day; so that we must conclude that the apostle Paul received baptism by affusion, and that he would practice the same when he "preached Christ in the synagogues, that he is the Son of God."—Acts ix. 20.

Then we follow him to Philippi, in which he says, "we were in that city abiding certain days. And on the sabbath we went out of the city by a river side, where prayer was wont to be made; and we sat down, and spake unto the women which resorted thither." Now it must be observed, that the apostle came to these women with no expectation of baptizing them, nor did the women come to be baptized, though there "was much water there." The purpose of the apostle was to preach Christ unto them: [1 Cor. i. 17.] the result being as it is written, "And a certain woman named Lydia, a seller of purple, of the city of Thyatira, which worshipped God heard us: whose heart the Lord opened, that she attended unto the things which were spoken of Paul. And when she was baptized, and her household, she besought us, saying, If ye have judged me faithful to the Lord, come into my house, and abide there."—Acts xvi. 14, 15. Therefore, Lydia and her household evidently were baptized previous to entering into the house, so that our Baptist friends surely will not contend that Lydia and her household were *dipped* in the river, without any intimation that such would be the case when they arrived there. Indeed, had they been *dipped*, they must have been put to the necessity of being *dipped* in the clothes they had on, or to have undressed by the river side, contrary to the

custom of the country—of which custom, the apostle approved, when writing to the church at Corinth. "For if the woman be not covered, let her also be shorn: but if it be a shame for a woman to be shorn or shaven, let her be covered."—1 Cor. xi. 6. If the apostle wrote thus, it is not likely that he would command Lydia to uncover in his presence. Hence we come to the conclusion, that Lydia and her household were baptized by affusion; there being no just grounds for *dipping* in the river, although "there was much water there."

The baptism of the Philippian jailor and his household, is sufficient to prove that the ordinance of baptism is not subject to time or place, but could be administered at midnight without the least inconvenience or delay. Therefore, if there be any difficulties in the way, those difficulties are created by the Baptist, who, in order to make out his *dipping*, will very gravely inform us, "that at midnight the jailor and his family, along with his prisoners, went down to a neighbouring stream; and there they might be *dipped* as conveniently as in a modern baptistry." But on examining the narrative it will be seen, that such a conclusion is wrong; for all the circumstances connected with the baptism of the jailor and his household, took place in one hour, probably half the hour being gone. During that hour there is an earthquake, which shakes the foundations of the prison—waking the jailor who had been charged to keep his prisoners safely, and for this purpose cast them into the inner prison. But the terror stricken jailor, "seeing the prison doors open, takes his sword and would have killed himself, supposing that the prisoners had been fled. But Paul cried with a loud voice, saying, Do thyself no harm: for we are all here. Then he called for a light, and sprang in, and came trembling, and fell down before Paul and Silas, And brought them out, and said, Sirs,

what must I do to be saved? And they said, believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy house. And they spake unto him the word of the Lord, and to all that were in his house. And he took them the same hour of the night, and washed their stripes; and was baptized, he and all his, straightway." All this taking place "in" the same hour of the night, would not leave much time for going down unto the river; indeed, it is not said that they left the prison until Paul and Silas were brought into the house, after the jailor and his household had been baptized. [Acts xvi. 27—34.] Therefore, if the Baptist will maintain his speculative idea, that these might be *dipped* in the river, we must also be permitted to give an opinion concerning the baptism of this household in the prison; and we say, that the water usually given to the prisoners to drink, would be sufficient for the purpose of baptizing a number of persons, so that there can be no difficulty connected with this baptism taking place within the prison at Philippi. Here again we are compelled to the necessity of believing that the jailor and his household were baptized by affusion, and hence we are led to the conclusion, that the apostle would baptize the household of Stephanus in the same way; also the twelve men he met at Ephesus, who were John's disciples, but afterwards received Christian baptism at the hands of the apostle.

Here we may remark, that it is not said in the New Testament that the twelve chosen by Christ were baptized, which is no proof that they were not baptized, for there is evidence that two of them had been baptized by John. [John i. 35—42.] So that, if it was necessary for twelve of John's disciples to be re-baptized, it was also necessary that these two, who became the disciples of Christ, should be baptized by him along with the others; and

as we have seen that the apostle Paul baptized by affusion, so those who had been baptized by John, and afterwards by Paul, could not understand baptism in any other sense: therefore there is not the least grounds for supposing that the apostles baptized by *dipping* under water. Hence, in the absence of evidence that such was the practice of the apostle, we are referred to his writings, as "incontrovertible evidence, that he taught the practice of *dipping*, in his epistles to the Romans and Colossians;" because he says, "Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death? Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death."—Rom. vi. 3, 4. "Buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead."—Col. ii. 12. Now these passages do not teach the practice of *dipping*, any more than the words of our Lord teach the Romish doctrine of Transubstantiation, when he said, "Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day. For my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed. He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him."—John vi. 54—56. Our Lord never intended his disciples to understand these words in their literal sense, for he immediately said unto them, "the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life."—John vi. 63. Then it is no matter of astonishment that men should err from the truths of the scriptures so as to establish their own doctrines of "the real presence," for "the natural man receiveth not the things of the spirit of God: for they are foolishness to him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned."—1 Cor. ii. 14. But the Romanists are not the only people who have mistaken the sense of the scriptures in

teaching their doctrines, for the Baptists are equally blamable in mistaking the apostle in the passages quoted, to make out their *dipping*, when the apostle distinctly says, that it is by faith the believer is baptized into the death of Christ. Then if it be by faith, why any representation of the burial with Christ by works? For if it be contrary to our senses to receive the Romish doctrine of Transubstantiation, it must also be contrary to our senses to receive the Baptist doctrine that we are buried with Christ, "by *dipping* into death." Therefore, with the apostle, we say, that this baptism is by "faith of the operation of God;" and hence it never was intended that there should be a literal representation of the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ, by the believer being "buried with him in *dipping*," for that would transfer the divine power "through faith" to the human power of works, which is in keeping with the nature of man when he seeks to establish a righteousness of his own. Therefore, those who cry down "human agency," and "human inventions," should be careful lest they be caught in their own craftiness, for there is not a system in connection with any church requiring more physical power, or human agency, than immersion—the death, burial, and resurrection, being performed by the officiating minister, which Baptists say is according to the teaching of the apostle Paul. Hence it must follow, that they who hold such to be "the truth," should in all justice attend to the instructions of the apostle when he says, "For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection: Knowing this, that our old man is crucified with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin."—Rom. vi. 5, 6. Nothing can be more clear than this, that the believer is to be planted and crucified with Christ. Then if there is to be a literal

representation of this burial and resurrection of the believer with Christ, and human agency be employed for that purpose, there should also be a literal representation of planting, and crucifying the believer with Christ by the same agency; which would lead us to a representative system of teaching that the believer is buried, raised, planted, and crucified with Christ by works, and not by faith. But, when we are told by the apostle Paul, that the believer is planted in the likeness of the death, and resurrection of Christ, [Rom. vi. 5.] it cannot be of works, but faith; and, if he be planted in his death by faith, so must he be buried with him "through the faith of the operation of God:" [Col. ii. 12.] indeed, the Romans could not understand the apostle in any other sense, for they disposed of their dead by burning them, and deposited the ashes in an urn, and therefore the burial of a body under water could not convey to the mind of the believer at Rome that it was "buried into death," such being contrary to the custom of the country. Yea, and it was also contrary to the custom of the Jews, who buried their dead in sepulchres hewn out of the rock; so that the apostle could not recommend to the Romans a burial by *dipping*, contrary to the practice of the Jews. And, because of this, some Baptists will go so far as to admit that the burial of the believer with Christ is by faith, according to the apostle Paul; yet they will not abandon their works in the water.

Mr. Rushton, a Particular Baptist, says, "believers are said to be crucified with Christ, dead with him, buried with him, and raised up together with him. For that spiritual or vital union to Christ, which believers enjoy by faith, is the effect of federal union, as the word of God abundantly teaches."* Others, on the contrary,

* Particular Redemption, page 124.

make as much of the baptistry as "the grave," as though Christ had not been buried in a sepulchre, but in "the water." Hence Mr. KERSHAW, in a sermon preached in Zoar Chapel, London, pointed to the baptistry saying, in the words of the angel, "come, see where the Lord lay;" as though his *dipping* had anything to do with the sepulchre (in which the Lord lay) hewn out of the rock. Mr. PRICE says, "from what little I know of Mr. KERSHAW I can venture to say, that he never intended to be understood literally." Again, in the same page he says, "Mr. L. does not like this literal representation of the death, burial, and resurrection of our Lord." Therefore, when Mr. PRICE knows his own faith, it will be time enough for him to defend others; for wherever the following lines are sung, the thoughts of the worshippers must be carried from the place where the angel said, "come, see where the Lord lay," to a place where the Lord never lay.

"Hear the blest Redeemer call you,
Listen to his gracious voice;
Dread no ills that can befall you,
While you make his ways your choice.
Jesus says, 'let each believer
Be baptized in my name:'
He himself in Jordan's river,
Was immersed beneath the stream.

Plainly here his footsteps tracing,
Follow him without delay;
Gladly his command embracing,
Lo! your Captain leads the way.
View the rite with understanding
Jesus' grave before you lies;
Be interred at his commanding,
After his example rise."

Such lines do not require much understanding, for it is easy to comprehend what is meant by them—teaching, as they do, to the mind of the believer, a false idea concerning his death, burial, and resurrection with Christ, which has a tendency to lead him to walk by sight and not by faith. This will appear more clear from the remarks of Dr. Carson, when he describes the burial of the believer with Christ :—" It is by burial that we die. We are supposed to be buried into death, and the figure is well fitted for the purpose. To immerse a living man affords an emblem of death as well as of burial. The baptized person dies under the water, and for a moment lies buried with Christ. Christ our death was spoken of under the figure of a baptism."—page 157. Here we have " the truth," as Baptists teach it, that men are buried alive! and die under the water! And anyone dying under such circumstances are said to be drowned, and if drowned by another, that person will be condemned for the awful crime of murder. Therefore, on examining the case of *dipping*, when a person is said to die " under the water," we must come to the conclusion that he came to his death by drowning; so that all who practice *dipping*, according to Dr. Carson, stand charged with the crime of murder. Then surely Christ never ordained such a practice in his church, for if the believer is not dead with Christ, before he dies and is buried in the water, most pitiable will be his condition; but if he be dead and buried by faith with Christ, then his *dipping* is nothing more than the enactment of a solemn farce without a meaning. Had Dr. Carson taught his doctrine that the " baptized person dies under the water," and practised the ceremony of a burial with Christ in the Church of Rome, it would not have been a matter of so much surprise, since there is a corresponding doctrine taught in that church, in the performance of a useless

tragedy, entitled "the sacrifice of the Mass." But when we see him setting forth a doctrine similar to those which belonged to the superstition of the dark ages, calculated to increase a formality that would give prominence to works, it is then that we are alarmed for the spiritual prosperity of the church of Christ; for "the just shall live by faith," and being baptized by faith into the death of Christ, no baptism of men shall supersede that which is "by faith of the operation of God." Holding fast by this, the song of the believer continually will be—

'Tis by faith we are baptized,
Into death with Christ the Lord;
And by faith that we are buried,
To fulfil his righteous word.
Hence through faith like him we're raised,
By the power of our God;
Crucified, and with him planted,
That our sins may be destroyed.

Before closing this part of my subject, I would cite from Tertullian, hoping that what he may say, will be sufficient to prove that baptism was administered by affusion; for, when speaking of the heathen practices of sprinkling, he says, "Even the gods themselves they honour by washings. Water everywhere carried about maketh expiation by sprinkling for town and country houses, temples, and entire cities. Certainly they are baptized at the games of Apollo and those at Eleusis; and this they suppose they do for regeneration and pardon in their perjuries." Other Fathers could be cited to prove these sprinklings of the heathen, as imitations of Christian baptism, but as Tertullian is so well known to the Baptist, probably what is said by him will be respected before all that might be said by others. Therefore I proceed to notice the next proposition.

FOURTH.—*The practice of Dipping, inconsistent and contrary to the word of God.*

THIS may be a startling piece of intelligence for the Baptist, but it is no less startling than it is true; for "THUS SAITH THE LORD, I will have mercy and not sacrifice:" therefore it is not likely that he would institute in his church anything having the appearance of a sacrifice, he having been sacrificed "once for all." But the practice of the Baptist is opposed to the language of Christ, for they will have sacrifice and not mercy. We may be told that no one has been known to take cold after immersion; if this be true, there are reasons to be assigned for it, such as warming the water a little, and taking a glass of wine or brandy after coming "up out of the water," to keep the cold out; of course I do not condemn them for taking every precaution against taking cold, but would advise them, as "prevention is better than cure," to dispense with their *dipping*, and then they would not let the cold in. But should the Baptist contend that *dipping* is according to the practice of the apostles, they must at least admit that the apostles gave no such gift as fire-water, but the gift of the Holy Ghost; [Acts iii. 6.] so that their practice does not exactly correspond with the apostolic practice of baptism. In modern times there appears to be, even in the most rigid sect of Baptists, a desire to consult the human feelings by departing from the running water, where many of their candidates have been carried down by the stream, and at other times both minister and candidate have lost their footing and fell with no small splash into the water; therefore it is no wonder that (for the sake of convenience) the river should be forsaken for the more convenient baptistry in the chapel, and those who do this (for the sake of convenience), ought never to

charge others with neglecting the ordinance of baptism, because they administer it by the more convenient mode of sprinkling. This was unquestionably the practice of the apostles, according to the New Testament. "As soon as the people were convinced of the truth of the report, and were rendered willing to be baptized, the rite was invariably performed upon them, and upon the spot. Wherever this occurred, and whether the converts were two or three thousand, there were no removals or delays; water sufficient was always at hand. No difficulty was ever started about second suits of clothes—or indelicacy of being plunged under water—the coldness of the weather—or the presence of spectators. You never read of persons shifting their clothes—or of being baptized naked—or of taking up the cross of baptism—or of contracting colds, and sore throats, or inducing apoplexy—or of large men and matrons overpowering little weak administrators—or of deferring the ceremony through indisposition—or of fearing to be popped under water by strangers—or of going home through shame of being immersed among their curious neighbours—or, in a word, of anything of the kind; all of which are valid proofs that baptism, in the apostles' time, differed essentially from the *dippings* of the present day."—THORNE, page 17.

We have, from the pen of the author of *Confessions of a Convert from Baptism in Water to Baptism with Water*, a few circumstances similar to those named by Mr. THORNE. Being brought up amongst Baptists of the most rigid sect, he had witnessed many immersions, and in describing some of these scenes he says, "although the entire spectacle was interesting, on one or two of these occasions there were some circumstances which specially impressed me. One of these was the shrill scream of a woman, as she felt herself going under the

water. Another was the struggling of a young person, who succeeded in wrenching herself from the minister's grasp, and fell with a loud splash into the baptistry. More than once I recollect that persons fainted in the water; and I distinctly retain the image of the ghastly and death-like countenance of a woman, as her head hung back, wet and motionless, over the arm of the person who dragged her into the vestry. At another time Mr. B. who I have said, was a short, stiff, portly person, lost his balance and his footing, while attempting to immerse a man twice his own bulk, and himself fell sideways, and with no small stir and splutter into the water." Again he says, "Amongst the attendants at our chapel, there were two very intelligent and devout young ladies, who had three years before left the Establishment, in which they were brought up, because they could not profit by the preaching which they heard there. As their hearts and their income were large, and their habits inexpensive, their liberality was felt by a great number of the poor, and at public collections their contributions generally exceeded that of others. But their health was extremely delicate, and by most they were considered as destined to an early grave. One of them suffered from an affection of the spine, and serious apprehensions were entertained that consumption had commenced its fatal course in the other. By their perusal of books in favour of immersion, with which they had been copiously supplied, together with the earnest persuasives of Mr. B., the sisters were brought to believe that it became them in this way to profess the gospel. About a month before their decision, a baptismal service had been performed at a small town a few miles from us; and amongst the immersed there was a young woman, at the time apparently in sound health, who caught a severe cold in the service, which speedily ran

on to fever delirium, and death. The cause was so evident, and the whole case so clear, that even the most contracted Baptist in our congregation (and there were those who seemed to think that God would actually work a miracle to counteract what, in some constitutions, would be the certain consequence of immersion) were confounded; whilst others confessed that 'it was a most mysterious providence.' This circumstance came to the ears of the two sisters, and it affected them deeply. Their first step was to send for Mr. B., but as he still assured them of their safety, without assigning, as they thought, any reason for such assurance, or producing a divine warrant to that effect, they were not satisfied; and therefore they wisely resolved to do what they now perceived ought to have been done before, viz. to consult their medical attendant on the subject. His judgment was very strong. He said it would be perilous in the extreme, and that he knew scarcely any cause more calculated to quicken incipient disease and accelerate death. This decided them. Convinced that He who desireth mercy and not sacrifice could not require them in such a way to hazard their lives, they wisely declined the service. As their case had created considerable interest, and their expected accession to the church was deemed of much importance, their withdrawment caused more commotion than even my delay." And this in the nineteenth century! Then, as Pædo-Baptists, we dare not sanction the sacrifice of human life, and gloss it over by calling it "a mysterious providence," for in that we should be little better than the founders of such a practice in the sixteenth century, whose fanaticism taught them to believe that whatever came to pass, was according to the will of God. Hence we read of one slaying his brother in the presence of many spectators, saying, "now is the will of the Father done."

On comparing the enthusiasm of some Baptists of the present day, it is questionable whether it be better than the fanaticism of their predecessors, who cast their their clothes into the fire and ran naked, saying, "woe! unto the cities of Germany." The only difference now is, in some of the churches of the strictest sect of Baptists, that the males go down "into the water" in their usual apparel. Were we to see a man bathing with his clothes on, we should say that he would be a fit subject for the lunatic asylum. Then what shall we say of a man, who is expected, above all men, to be in his right mind, when we see him going down into the water in a good suit of black cloth? Such a scene I witnessed not long ago; being somewhat curious to witness an immersion, and being informed that there were two persons to be immersed, I went to one of the most rigid Baptist chapels in the city, where it was to take place. The sermon preached on the occasion, was, for the most part, everything that I could have wished, being according to what I have advanced in the first part of this book. But if the practice had been according to the precept, as laid down in the first heads of the sermon, I should have been the last person to complain, but the minister appearing to be conscious that a many had "come out of curiosity," he addressed us as sprinklers—not forgetting the case of the eunuch and the "into" and "out of the water," with now and then a little brawling "where is sprinkling now," and "who hath required this at your hands?" Then there was a pause, and an apology, as "no offence was intended," which of course was accepted with the best feelings, knowing that men are always the most clamourous, when their "craft is in danger."—Acts xix. 27. Because a few Independents and Baptists have agreed to build a chapel, and worship together, it was said, "The Independents will take all

fish that comes into their net. They are giving way under the powerful arguments of this ordinance." Had the minister said, the Baptists are giving way under the powerful arguments of the Independents, then he would have been much nearer the mark; for it cannot be a mystery that the Sun of righteousness has arisen with healing in his wings, [Mal. iv. 2.] and dispersed the mist which has arisen out of the baptistry—that we now behold the half dried baptistry, hoping to see the time when the other half shall have evaporated, that our friends may come over "on dry ground"—then we shall be one people, having "One Lord, one faith, one baptism." But to describe the scene which took place after the sermon. All appeared in a state of confusion; every one being anxious to have a sight of the "interment," many took up their position near the "grave." The deacons being more thoughtful of the matting than the candidates, carefully drew it aside. During the singing of a hymn, the minister and candidates appeared. The minister wore water-tight boots (certainly not such as the apostles wore); the candidates were not so highly favoured—neither had they the burial shroud usual for an interment—but they went down "both into the water," and he immersed the lady as she was the first to go down into the water. On coming "up out of the water," a cloak was immediately thrown over her, which at once convinced me of the folly of human systems, for I never knew of any defects in the Christian religion, requiring a cloak to hide them; neither do I know of any such preparations being made by any of the apostles, who baptized thousands in a day. Therefore this practice must be set down as of human invention. The other immersion was that of a young man, who went down into the water in his ordinary clothing! Some of the deacons were stationed near to the baptistry, as I

suppose, to see that the "burial" was complete. However, there was no mistake about that, as I could not see the shadow of the person under the water, and therefore the sexton must have done his work well. This brought to my mind a circumstance I had read, in the *Confessions of a Convert from Baptism in Water, to Baptism with Water*, page 27. "At one of these seasons, my curiosity was keenly excited by seeing the same individual *dipped* twice; I was much amused to find that an officious little fellow, a shoemaker, whom we called 'Tim,' and who was standing near the baptistry at the time, positively declared to Mr. B., in a low tone, that he plainly saw the poor woman's nose high and dry above water, and that therefore she was not baptized, and should not sit at the table unless she was *dipped* again, which was accordingly done." As this could not be said of the case before us, I suppose the individual was duly admitted to sit down at the table. However, on coming "up out of the water," gasping for breath, he appeared to stumble, but through the kindness of the deacons in attendance, he was prevented from falling into the "grave" from which he had recently risen. Dripping with water, he was compelled to walk into the vestry before a gazing people; and the service was then concluded by singing, "Praise God from whom all blessings flow," and in this I am sorry to say, that I could take no part, knowing that such scenes I had just witnessed, had been a curse to many in sacrificing their lives, and in hindering others from joining a Christian church. This hinderance has been felt by many Baptist churches to be an obstacle to the progress of truth, and therefore, as wise men, they have opened their communion, "that the word of the Lord may have free course, and be glorified."—2 Thess. iii. 1. Then surely God has not instituted the practice of *dipping* as the ordinance of baptism, that his

word should not "have free course and be glorified," when we are informed by Baptists themselves "that it hinders their progress, and their converts are few;" yet, notwithstanding, it may be that many have been convinced of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment to come, through the faithful appeal of a Baptist minister, but when they have been pointed to the baptistry as "the place where the Lord lay," and been told that they must "follow the Lord," by going through the ordeal of a burial and resurrection before an assembled congregation, probably more curious than interested in the ceremony, they have gone back with disgust determined that they would not profess Christ by taking up what the rigid Baptist calls the "cross of baptism." Thus what the Baptist builds up in the pulpit. he pulls down in the baptistry; for it cannot be possible that God should strive with men to convince them of sin, and then place obstacles in the way of their coming to the truth and joining his church. This would be contrary to his purpose, and inconsistent with his word; for he has said, "So shall my word be that goeth forth out of my mouth; it shall not return unto me void, but it shall accomplish that which I please, and it shall prosper in the thing whereto I sent it."—Isaiah lv, 11. Therefore the evil must be connected with men when they substitute for the word of God their own doctrines and inventions: and this evil, I am sorry to say, is connected with some who profess the name of Christ, and are very severe with their criticisms on the doctrines of those who differ with them, professing to repudiate "all human agency, of works and merit, the regenerating influences of the baptismal water," taught by a certain church, and this because they call themselves "the elect"—being led by the Spirit into all truth, and, of course, *they only* are in possession of "the truth," and cannot err from "the

truth." Thus they claim the doctrine of infallibility, and to be the only people and church of God. But as the church of Rome claims the same privilege, we must compare their doctrines and try them whether they be of God. The priest of the church of Rome blesses the water used in baptism, which is said to convey regeneration, or inward grace to the child: the Baptist translation of the scriptures teach a salvation by *dipping* to the adult. Then wherein do the Romanists and Baptists differ? especially, now the rigid Baptists have their *blessed* water, which we learn from the following lines—

"Bless'd pool! in which I lately lay
And left my fears behind;
What an unworthy wretch am I!
And God profusely kind."

Here is a tacit acknowledgment that the fears, which can only have to do with the mind, are left behind in the water; thus the "blessed pool" has its healing virtues so as to remove all fear from the mind. Now this is all that the Romanist asks, and all he believes. Therefore, if the doctrines of the church of Rome be inconsistent and contrary to the word of God, so must the doctrines of the rigid Baptist be inconsistent and contrary to the word of God, when they glory and boast in their taking up the "cross of baptism." The apostle Paul gloried in no such cross; for it is to such that he would say, as he said to the Galatian church, now that baptism is the seal of the covenant in the place of circumcision. [Gal. iii. 27—29.] "As many as desire to make a fair shew in the flesh, they constrain you to be *dipped;* only lest they should suffer persecution for the cross of Christ. For neither they themselves who are *dipped* keep the law; but desire to have you *dipped,* that they may glory in your flesh. But God forbid that

I should glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom the world is crucified unto me, and I unto the world."—Gal. vi. 12—14. Thus it was not circumcision, or baptism that the apostle preached, for that availeth nothing, "but a new creature." And this is the cross we preach, seeing there are one thousand millions of human beings on the earth, and seven hundred millions have made no profession of the gospel; whilst God says, "Look unto me, and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth: for I am God, and there is none else. I have sworn by myself, the word is gone out of my mouth in righteousness, and shall not return, that unto me every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear."—Isaiah xlv. 22, 23. And because this shall be so, shall we be indolent, and, like the rigid Baptist, make no effort to save the heathen? Surely the man must be beside himself, who professes to be a disciple of the Lord Jesus, and does not understand the commission, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature."—Mark xvi. 15. Hence the gospel is not intended for a sect who may call themselves by a particular name, and have passed into the church through the door of immersion; "For whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved. How then shall they call on him in whom they have not believed? and how shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard? and how shall they hear without a preacher? And how shall they preach without they be sent."—Romans x. 13—15. And do we not learn that such have been sent who have preached the everlasting gospel, whose labours have been abundantly blessed? And now the strongholds of Satan begin to shake. China is ready to receive the gospel. "Behold, these shall come from far; and, lo, these from the north and

from the west; and these from the land of Sinim."—Isaiah xlix. 12. An effectual door is opened in British India; there one hundred and twelve thousand persons have been baptized, and renounced idolatry: the South Sea Islanders have cast their idols to the moles and to the bats; and now we look forward, anxiously awaiting the time when the "glory of the Lord shall be revealed, and all flesh shall see it together," [Isaiah xl. 5.] "For the earth shall be filled with the knowledge of the glory of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea."—Hab. ii. 14. Yes, and all this is being accomplished without the assistance of the rigid Baptist; proving, that God can carry on his work, and will accomplish all that he hath spoken without their assistance. Shall we say let them alone, they know not what they do, for they have not the same gospel Paul preached, when he said, "Knowing therefore the terror of the Lord, we persuade men."—2 Cor. v. 11. "To the weak became I as weak, that I might gain the weak: I am made all things to all men, that I might by all means save some."—1 Cor. ix. 22. What missionary zeal was displayed by the apostle,—how he longed to see the salvation of his kinsmen in the flesh. "Brethren, my hearts desire and prayer to God for Israel is, that they might be saved."—Rom. x. 1. It is impossible for a disciple of Christ to deny the gospel to the heathen, as though it was not intended for him, for God is "not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance."—2 Peter, iii. 9. Church of the living God, "Arise, shine; for thy light is come, and the glory of the Lord is risen upon thee. And the Gentiles shall come to thy light, and kings to the brightness of thy rising. Then thou shalt see, and flow together, and thine heart shall fear, and be enlarged; because the abundance of the sea shall be converted unto thee, the forces of the Gentiles shall come unto thee."—

Isaiah lx. 1, 3, 5. Watchmen in Zion, blow the gospel trumpet, warn the people, your master bids you. "Say unto them, As I live, saith the Lord God, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked; but that the wicked turn from his way and live: turn ye, turn ye from your evil ways; for why will ye die, O house of Israel?"—Ezekiel xxxiii. 11. "And they that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament; and they that turn many to righteousness as the stars for ever and ever."—Daniel xii. 3.

Then let us not be deceived by those who make bold pretensions to the truth; who say in their hearts, "The temple of the Lord, The temple of the Lord, are these," [Jer. vii. 4.] and so deny to us the right hand of Christian fellowship, because we cannot see the truth in their *dipping*. Again, they will tell us that they are "the despised few spoken of in the scriptures. By one offering for ever perfected and sanctified." Hence their salvation is certain, whatever their backslidings or shortcomings may be in their character and duration. They cannot be lost. A doctrine not from heaven, but from the father of lies, who was a liar and murderer from the beginning, when he tempted Eve in the garden of Eden. "Ye shall not surely die:" on which Dr. Adam Clarke comments—"Ye shall not only retain your present blessedness, but it shall be greatly increased, a temptation by which he has ever since fatally succeeded in the ruin of multitudes of souls, whom he pursuaded that being once right they could never finally go wrong." Then we need not be surprised concerning the Antinomian doctrine of the final perseverance of the saints, for its origin was in hell, and its end must be there also. "Let no man deceive you by any means: for that day shall not come, except there come a falling away first,

and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition."—[2 Thess. ii. 3.] Then let the Antinomians, who are puffed up with their final perseverance, continue in their licentiousness, having returned like a dog to his vomit, and as a sow that is washed to her wallowing in the mire." But let them remember, that "for this cause God shall send them strong delusion, that they shall believe a lie: That they all might be damned who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness."—2 Thess. ii. 11, 12. "For it is impossible for those who were once enlightened, and have tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost, And have tasted the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come, If they shall fall away, to renew them again unto repentance; seeing they crucify unto themselves the Son of God afresh, and put him to an open shame."—Hebrews vi. 4—6.

Then, dear reader, if you have been made a partaker of the Holy Ghost, "Be not high minded but fear," for it is only as you "hold fast the confidence and the rejoicing of the hope unto the end," [Heb. iii. 6.] that you will be able to overcome, and to sit down with Christ on his throne, even as he overcame and is sat down on his Father's throne. [Rev. iii. 21.] Shun the Antinomian doctrine, as you would shun its author; lest it should be said unto you, "I know thy works, that thou art neither cold nor hot: I would that thou wert cold or hot. So then because thou art lukewarm, and neither cold nor hot, I will spue thee out of my mouth."—Rev. iii. 15 16. Ask not whether there be few or many saved; your business is to "Strive to enter in at the strait gate."—Luke xiii. 24. There are some who will tell you, as I have heard a minister say in a Rigid Baptist Chapel, "you that cannot pray, Christ will

pray you into heaven." But unto such the Lord says, "woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye shut up the kingdom of heaven against men: for you neither go in yourselves, neither suffer ye them that are entering to go in."—Matt. xxiii. 13. The apostle says, "pray without ceasing."

"Prayer is the Christian's vital breath
The Christian's native air;
His watchword at the gates of death:
He enters heaven with prayer."

"Now the God of peace, that brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus, that great Shepherd of the sheep, through the blood of the everlasting covenant, Make you perfect in every good work to do his will, working in you that which is wellpleasing in his sight, through Jesus Christ: to whom be glory for ever and ever. Amen."—Heb. xiii. 20, 21.

"By milder ways doth Jesus prove
His Father's cov'nant, and his love;
He seals to saints his glorious grace,
And not forbids their infant race.

Their seed is sprinkled with his blood,
Their children set apart for God;
His Spirit on their offspring shed,
Like water pour'd upon the head.

Let every saint with cheerful voice
In this large covenant rejoice;
Young children in their early days
Shall give the God of Abra'm praise."

APPENDIX.

I cannot allow the notice of my last publication in the *Earthen Vessel*, to pass by without a remark. To expose the spirit of the people with whom we have to do, the following was given in that Magazine, *September*, 1854. "R. A. LANCASTER'S *Infant Baptism, &c.* is thankfully received; but for us to be proving that to be scriptural,—which stands out in every part of the Word so boldly; that which was practised and commanded by our divine Master; that which all the apostles attended to; and which the Holy Spirit, has in every age, led thousands to receive and attend unto,—for us to be defending such a Biblical practice, such a New Testament ordinance, is like holding a candle to the sun. Blind bats that cannot see, presumptuous men, that will not see, and accommodating Jesuits that do not wish to see. The Truth, either in principle or practice, always will be found in this imperfect world. Our Master says, 'Let the dead bury their dead; follow thou me.' May we have grace to do this, and we shall do well. Nevertheless, the pamphlet sent us may yet be noticed." As the author of that pamphlet, I rejoice to learn that it has fallen into the hands of those for whom it was intended; feeling assured that it has been the means of bringing forth important concessions from one professing the same faith as the editor of the *Earthen Vessel*, who has failed to establish his practice of *dipping* as a "Biblical practice," having agreed with me in my principal arguments as the practice commanded by God.

From the language used by the editor of the *Earthen Vessel*, I have been expecting a severe criticism on what I advanced in defence of Infant Baptism; however, I am agreeably surprised to find in the *Earthen Vessel* a

better cargo this month *(October)*, for the editor says, he believes "men, women, and children were baptized when passing through the Red Sea." Now it is from the New Testament that we have evidence that such a baptism did take place, and it is only by referring to the Old Testament that we learn who were included in these words, "our fathers were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea," and then we find them to include "men, women, and children." Therefore, if the editor of the *Earthen Vessel*, and the sect of Baptists whom he represents, claim to be the children or descendents of these "fathers," then it is important that they should know that their fathers were baptized in their infancy; of which the apostle says, "I would not that you should be ignorant." Thus Infant Baptism is a doctrine of the New Testament, and taught by the apostle Paul; so that whoever rejects his testimony are not "baptized into the cloud of God's truth," but are baptized into the cloud of darkness and ignorance, which the apostle was so anxious the church at Corinth should avoid. Again, the editor of the *Earthen Vessel*, feeling the pressure of our arguments, is compelled to give up the idea that the Israelites were immersed in water, "because the waters were a wall unto them, on their right hand and on their left." But he is determined that we shall not "walk off with the laurel;" for, if he is to have no immersion, we must have no sprinkling when he says, "if we can get no immersion in the Red Sea, so our good friends the Pædo-Baptists, can get no sprinkling for themselves; so that it becomes a dry affair on both sides. For neither can get much water, or little water; so of necessity it must here at the Red Sea, be a dry baptism." A dry baptism! and yet he goes on to say, "We still believe they were immersed in the cloud and emersed from it into open day, and were thus baptized in the

cloud and in the sea; and as we believe they were a typical people, and as they were baptized men, women, and children, so we believe all true Israelites are baptized by the Holy Spirit of God into the cloud of God's truth." Yes, the editor of the *Earthen Vessel* really believes children were immersed, though he ridicules our practice of sprinkling them on the ground of unconsciousness! Then how cunning he is in using the term immersed to suit his purpose when the baptism of water is mentioned, and then to borrow from us the term baptized when the baptism of the Holy Spirit is spoken of. How accommodating! yet he calls us, "accommodating Jesuits, that do not wish to see the truth." Then what a figure a cloud is of God's truth, for all must know who have the truth and are in the light of God's truth, that a cloud is a sign of darkness, especially when they are in the midst of a fog, or, as the editor of the *Earthen Vessel* would say, "immersed in the cloud" on a misty morning. However, from what knowledge I have of the scriptures, I know that light is connected with truth, and as the soul of the believer longs after the truth, his prayer will be, "O send out thy light and thy truth; let them lead me; let them bring me to thy holy hill, and to thy tabernacles."—Psalm xliii. 3. Then when he is permitted to walk in this light, in the ecstasy of his soul he exclaims, "Thy word is a lamp unto my feet, and a light unto my path."—Psalm cxix. 105. Thus, all "cloud" or darkness must disappear before the light of God's truth, for "what communion hath light with darkness?"—2 Cor. vi. 14. But, because we have no desire to be "immersed into the cloud of God's truth," and grope our way in the dark, we are called "blind bats, that cannot see." However, the editor of the *Earthen Vessel* may speak reproachfully of us, we trust we have found a better

light than he can supply us with, in Him who said, "I am the light of the world: he that followeth me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life."—John viii. 12. And having this light of life, we shall have the truth, for "he that doeth truth cometh to to the light, that his deeds may be made manifest, that they are wrought of God."—John iii. 21. Then we shall be careful that we bring in no cloud to interfere with God's truth, in putting "darkness for light, and light for darkness;" [Isaiah v. 20.] and knowing the evil consequences that must follow such false teaching, we prefer to walk in the light of God's truth, that we may be able to distinguish those who speak not according to the truth, "because there is no light in them."—Isaiah viii. 20.

Once more, the editor of the *Earthen Vessel* has distinguished himself by discovering a new invention; for, when giving a definition of the term baptism, he says, "As we cannot express its meaning by one word, we must use two words; and these two words shall be immersion-emersion; or burial-resurrection. Let the reader then, be careful to notice this—that baptism does not mean simply immersion, or burying; but means also, and equally, emersion, or rising up again." Then again he says, "Now, if baptism consisted in immersion only, without emersion, then it would look as though the Egyptians, and not the Israelites, were baptized in the Red Sea. But we beg to assure our friends that the Egyptians were not baptized, but drowned in the Red Sea. There was, it is true, immersion, but no emersion; therefore it was not baptism." It is here admitted that immersion is not baptism, which is something like the truth; for there is no passing by the fact of the Egyptians being immersed in the Red Sea, though it is nowhere said that they were baptized. The

editor of the *Earthen Vessel* seeing this difficulty, is anxious to get out of it by any means, that he may establish his *dipping*, or immersion, as a "Biblical practice," (and for this purpose denies the arguments of other Baptists who say, that "baptism means to *dip*, or immerse only,") by introducing the term emersion as the completion of baptism. Now, according to Johnson and Barclay, emersion, means "the act of coming into view again, the rising of any solid above the surface of a fluid, into which it is violently thrust." Then the Egyptians were violently thrust into the Red Sea, and were buried, or immersed; yea, "the depths covered them, they sank into the bottom as a stone."—Exodus xv. 5. Thus they were immersed in the strictest sense of the term, and were also emersed, for "Israel saw the Egyptians dead upon the sea shore."—Exodus xiv. 3. Thus the immersion of the Egyptians was completed by their emersion from the sea, and their dead bodies coming into view again; clearly proving that baptism does not consist in "immersion, and emersion,"—else the Egyptians, and not the Israelites, were baptized contrary to the declaration of the apostle Paul.

Having thus proved that immersion and emersion is not scriptural baptism, the editor of the *Earthen Vessel* must submit to our "walking off with the laurel," and allow us to continue our Biblical practice which he has admitted in the baptism of "men, women, and children." And now as we have such concessions from those who have opposed Infant Baptism, we have reason to hope that the time will never come which Dr. GILL waited for, when he said, "I believe with a firm and unshaken faith, that the time is hastening on, when Infant Baptism will be no more practised in the world." But had Dr. GILL known what some of those who follow him, in the same faith have written in our favour, and been

permitted to see the Jubilee of the Lancashire Congregational Union, and to hear how Pædo-Baptism has spread with Congregationalism, his firm faith must have been shaken so as to confess, "This is the Lord's doing, and it is marvellous in our eyes." Should the editor of the *Earthen Vessel* persist in teaching his doctrine of *dipping* as a fundamental principle of truth, we can only pity him, and all who are connected with him in the same faith, because of the advice he gives to them "let the dead bury their dead." Thus because we cannot see the truth in being *dipped*, we are "dead," and are left to bury our dead. But these words have more to do with those who use them, since they profess to bury their dead in the place "where the Lord lay;" which place is better calculated for the finny tribe—for the life of the believer is not hid in the water, but "is hid with Christ in God;" [Col. iii. 3.] and for the sustenance of of that life he partakes freely of the water of life, which is in him "springing up into everlasting life."—John iv. 14. Therefore, if we are told the believer lives by seeing (what some call) the "truth" in their *dipping*, we deny it on scriptural grounds, for with the water in our eyes, we shall only "see men as trees walking," [Mark viii. 24.] but with "our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with water," [Heb. x. 22.] we shall be sanctified and cleansed, that we may be a glorious church, "not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing."—Ephesians v. 27. And the church when sanctified and cleansed, "looketh forth as the morning, fair as the moon, clear as the sun, and terrible as an army with banners," and as "the light of the world. A city set on an hill that cannot be hid." She puts her light on a candlestick, that it may give light unto all in the world, that she may see the fulfilment of

the promise—"And the Gentiles shall see thy righteousness, and all kings thy glory: and thou shalt be called by a new name, which the mouth of the Lord shall name." Isaiah lxii. 2. Then she will understand these words to do them: "Enlarge the place of thy tent, and let them stretch forth the curtains of thy habitations: spare not, lengthen thy cords, and strengthen thy stakes; For thou shalt break forth on the right hand and on the left; and thy seed shall inherit the Gentiles, and make the desolate cities to be inhabited."—Isaiah liv. 2, 3. And when this is done, there shall be none to "say, Stand by thyself, come not near to me, for I am holier than thou," because they have been washed in the baptistry; for God shall say, "These are a smoke in my nose, a fire that burneth all the day."—Isaiah lxv. 5. Neither shall there be any more strict or closed communion: all having experienced the truth and power of the scriptures, shall open their communion, saying, "thy gates shall be open continually; they shall not be shut day nor night; that men may bring unto thee the forces of the Gentiles, and that their kings may be brought. For the nation and kingdom that will not serve thee shall perish; yea, those nations shall be utterly wasted."—Isaiah lx. 11, 12. Therefore "ye that make mention of the Lord, keep not silence," but "Go through, go through the gates; prepare ye the way of the people; cast up, cast up the highway; gather out the stones; lift up a standard for the people."—Isaiah lxii. 6, 10.

FREDERICK WILCOCK, PRINTER, 23, FAULKNER-STREET, MANCHESTER.